

THE
MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1854.

ART. I.—WILBERFORCE ON THE EUCHARIST.*

It speaks well, on the whole, for the Christian mind of England, that this important work has met with so favorable a reception from it, as to have run already nearly, or by this time perhaps altogether, to the end of its second edition. The first seems to have been exhausted almost as soon as it came from the press. Considering the character of the book, this is something significant, and as we say furnishes just cause for satisfaction. Our satisfaction with it need not depend at all on the view we may take of the author's doctrine and argument. Whatever may be thought of this, all who care for theology and religion, which are still at last the greatest interests of the age, ought certainly to be pleased that the subject here discussed by Archdeacon Wilberforce, entering as it does into the inmost sanctuary of Christian science and life, should be found able to engage in this form so much prompt and active attention. There is a style of theology, we know, and a manner of religion, which would fain be done forever with all inquiry and discussion looking in any such direction; a theology and religion, for which the whole doctrine of the sacraments resolves itself into the simplest naturalism and every-day common sense, without any sort of mystery whatever, and in whose eyes accordingly every attempt to make more of them in any way is set down at once for solemn super-

* THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. *By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A. M., Archdeacon of the East Riding.* London: 1853. Republished in this country by H. Hooker, Philadelphia.

stition and nonsense. But this system of thinking carries its sentence of condemnation on its own forehead. Wherever it prevails, Christianity is found to part continually more and more with its proper character, both as life and doctrine. Whether men choose to know it, and lay it to heart, or not, the view that is taken of the Holy Sacraments, as conditioning the view that is taken of the Holy Catholic Church, and through this again the view that is taken of the whole mystery of the Incarnation, must ever be of radical and primary account in all true Christian theology. Especially must this be the case with the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which has been regarded from the beginning as the most solemn among all the services of the Church, the foundation of its entire worship, and the beating, living heart, we may say, of its universal life. Not to feel its central significance in such view, and not to take an active interest in the proper solution and settlement of the great questions which it involves as an article of piety and faith, is to stand convicted at once of being in a false position with regard to the grace of the Gospel generally. It is a position as different, as any that can well be imagined, from that of the ancient Church. It is completely at war also with the tone of thought which prevailed, on all sides, in the age of the Reformation. Its affinities are with heresy, rationalism, and unbelief. We have reason to welcome then any work, which, like this of Wilberforce, aims in a serious and earnest way, with powerful argument and comprehensive learning, to call the attention of the Protestant world to this momentous subject; and it is a gratification to know, that in the midst of the downward tendencies of the present time, a work on such subject and of such character should be received, as this has been at least in England, with so much interest and favor. We would be glad, if it could be brought to have still greater circulation in America. Not, as we have already intimated, for the sake of its own particular doctrine, so far as this may be considered peculiar in any view; but for the sake rather of its general object and purpose, the discussion namely of the true meaning of the Holy Eucharist, and the determination of what is to be

considered the proper faith of Protestantism with regard to it, as measured by the faith and practice of the early Church.

The author tells us in his Introduction, that the present work is the sequel of his Treatise on the Doctrine of the Incarnation, published a few years since. It was there asserted, that the "Sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation," and a chapter was devoted to the consideration of them in this view. But the thought was felt to require more full discussion. Another work followed, accordingly, on the Doctrine of Holy Baptism; and now we have, to complete the plan, this present volume on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. The same general view of the nature of Christianity, of course, runs through all these three treatises. They go, in a certain respect, to make up a common whole, the view that is taken of the Sacraments being conditioned, as just stated, by the view that is taken of the mystery of the Incarnation. This is a relation, indeed, that must always hold in any theological system. As men think of the Sacraments, so will they be found in every case, on proper inquiry, to think also of the Incarnation. A Gnostic Eucharist or the contrary, implies a Gnostic Christ or the contrary. It must not be supposed, however, in the case before us, that the author's doctrine of the Incarnation and doctrine of the Eucharist are so bound together, as to make this last dependent absolutely on all the details which enter into the first. Some, we know, have taken exception to certain parts of the first work, as involving to their mind a questionable philosophy, which they have pretended to censure at times under the vague and convenient title of pantheism. We do not suppose it to be fairly open in truth to any such charge. But what we wish to say here is, that no philosophical difficulty which any may be pleased to attribute to it in this way, can be regarded as extending to the present work. So far as the author's view of the Eucharist is conditioned by his view of the Incarnation, it is not in any such way as to include the questionable conceptions which have been charged upon him by those of whom we now speak; on the contrary, these are carefully avoided, the consequences being so ordered

here as to refuse rather than to require any sense of that sort for the premises exhibited in the other case. It is simply with the mystery of the Incarnation as a fact, in the form in which it comes before us in the New Testament and in the universal faith of the ancient Christian Church, that the relation is supposed to hold which imparts to the mystery of the Holy Supper, as a parallel fact, its true character and meaning. In the book before us, accordingly, the whole subject is treated as a matter of fact and authority merely, rather than as a matter of theory and speculation. On all points involved in the discussion, the appeal is in the first place to the Scriptures, and then in the next place to the judgment and practice of the Church in the first ages. Not as if this ancient tradition were taken to be an independent and separate authority, co-ordinate with the written word. "Scripture is referred to as the paramount authority, but when its meaning is disputed, the judgment of the early ages has been taken," we are told, "as being a safer exponent of its real purpose than mere logical arguments."

"And surely there is no point," our author goes on to say, "on which the judgment of primitive Christians is of more value than this. For it was a point on which their judgment was entirely unanimous. On many subjects the Church was early rent into parties; so that at times it was difficult to say what doctrine was predominant. But respecting the Holy Eucharist there existed no symptom of disagreement for eight centuries and a half. No doubt the received doctrine had been earlier disputed, but it was not by dissentients within the Church, but by external opponents. The Gnostics, who denied that the Holy Eucharist was the Flesh of our Lord, cut themselves off in the second century from the Church; and the Messalian heretics who denied that this sacred food was either beneficial or injurious, were cut off from it by its public sentence in the fourth. These external assaults throw greater light upon the unanimity which prevailed within. So that Paschasius is the first author who has ever been alleged to have introduced any doctrine, which did not meet with universal

approval; and the statements of earlier writers were admitted at the time to express the collective judgment of the whole community. Now those who look to the first Christians merely as witnesses, must allow that they were so far competent judges of the system which was delivered to them, that they could not all have been mistaken respecting its characteristic features. And those who take a higher view of the Church's judgment, and admit it to possess authority in controversies of faith, cannot dispute its decision upon a point on which there was no dissension. For the eight centuries and a half which precede Paschasius, are those also which precede Photius; they are the period when the East and the West were yet undivided, and when the Church could appeal with the fullest confidence to the promise of a supernatural guidance."

Pursuing this line of argument, the work devotes itself to the task of proving, "that Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist is a real presence; that the blessings of the new life are truly bestowed in it through communion with the New Adam; that consecration is a real act, whereby the inward part or thing signified is joined to the outward and visible sign; and that the Eucharistic oblation is a real sacrifice." These are considered to be practical points, on which it is possible to produce distinct evidence from Scripture and the primitive Church; whereas the mode or manner in which the general mystery is brought to pass, whether it be by transubstantiation or in some other way, is supposed not to have come under consideration during the first eight centuries; and for this reason it is not allowed to come here into any particular discussion.

The first point considered is the *consecration* of the elements. The words of institution are found plainly to imply, that the bread and wine used in the Eucharist are made to receive a new quality or character, by God's blessing, by which they become distinguished from all other bread and wine, and acquire a fitness for the use here made of them which they would not otherwise have. The separation is not merely nominal, something that is of force only in the minds of those who take part in the service; it exists objectively in the elements them-

selves. They are not what they were before. It is not bread and wine in general that can serve the purposes of this Sacrament, as any water may serve the purposes of Baptism; the case requires bread and wine set previously in supernatural connection with that which they are employed to signify and represent. They are set apart and made meet for this use by their consecration; which therefore is a real act, that joins in a real way the thing signified with the sign. So the words of institution most naturally and obviously teach; and such, accordingly, was the interpretation they received from the first in the Christian Church. With regard to this point, all know, who have given the least attention to ecclesiastical history, that in the first ages, as far back as to the very time of the Apostles, there was but one opinion. The elements consecrated, the Fathers tell us from Ignatius and Justin Martyr onwards, were held to be no longer common bread and wine, but "the Flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus." They must be consecrated, to become what the mystery of the Sacrament required; and when so consecrated they were made to possess in fact a new character that did not belong to them before, in virtue of which they might be considered and named the Body and Blood of Christ. Hence the vast importance which was always attached to the act of consecration; and along with this the belief also that it could not be effected, save by those to whom a specific commission had been transmitted, carrying along with it the power of a true priestly office. It is enough to refer here to the ancient Liturgies. They have but one voice on the subject; and every early writer utters himself, wherever he has occasion to do so, in the same general way.

From this view of the consecration of the elements, as being an essential characteristic of the Eucharist, the consequence is supposed necessarily to follow that the inward blessing which results from it is bestowed through its outward form. The connection between the sign and the thing signified, in other words, is so real and objective, that the first carries along with it really and truly the presence of the second. The elements are not only a pledge, but the very vehicle itself of the grace

or gift, to which, by previous consecration, they have become thus sacramentally bound. The relation of course is not physical, but moral; it holds not in the order of nature, but in the order of grace. Still it is none the less sure and certain on this account. In the economy of the Christian salvation, the Sacraments are made, by God's sovereign good pleasure and will, to be real, and not simply imaginary channels of the grace they represent; and in the case of the Holy Eucharist, the instrument of such consequence is not a sacramental act merely, as in the administration of Baptism, but the elements themselves solemnly prepared for the purpose beforehand by proper consecration. To prove the necessity of this view our author first takes up those modern systems by which it is denied, and tries to show that they necessarily run themselves into consequences that destroy faith altogether. These reduce themselves to the two theories of Zuinglius and Calvin. With Zuinglius, all is made to depend on the mind of the receiver. Consecration adds nothing to the elements. The Lord's Supper sinks into a mere outward commemoration. There is no mystery in it whatever. This is such rationalism as runs at once towards open infidelity. So it was regarded by Calvin, who labored accordingly to give the institution a higher character for the Reformed Church. He insists much on the idea of our actual communication with Christ's Body, and maintains, that this interior benefit goes along with the participation of the sacramental elements in the case of true believers; while yet, according to our author, the inward and outward here are not allowed to come, to any true and real conjunction. The connection is regarded as holding only in the mind and intention of God; just as the bow in the clouds is a token of safety for the world, not because it has in itself any tendency to prevent a deluge, but because it expresses the intention of the Almighty to this effect. The efficiency of the institution is made to fall back thus on the secret counsel, by which God wills some of the human family to bliss and others to misery. To the former only are the elements really the seal of an inward gift; to the latter they are but the empty eating of bread and

wine. The objection then against Calvin's theory of the Holy Eucharist, according to Archdeacon Wilberforce, is, "that it involves that dogma of reprobation, which is the opprobrium of his system;" from which it follows, that as the theory of Zuinglius is found to be inconsistent with the first principles of Christian piety, "so is Calvin's with any due respect for the declarations of Scripture and the character of God." These theories being shown to be thus defective and false, the only view which remains is that which supposes the peculiar grace of the Eucharist to be comprehended, not merely in the disposition of the receiver, and not merely in the merciful purpose of God, but actually and truly in the consecrated elements themselves.

The work before us proceeds, accordingly, in the next place, to establish this construction of our Lord's words of institution by the testimony of the ancient Church. This divides itself into three parts. First, the evidence of the ancient Liturgies. These are numerous, reaching back to the first centuries, and representing, not the opinions of a few only, but the faith and worship of the Church in all parts of the world. They are, at the same time, with all their differences in secondary details, wonderfully harmonious in their general conception and sense, being all constructed on a common plan and embodying throughout one and the same reigning idea; a form of unity and universality, which can never be satisfactorily accounted for, except on the supposition of their being derived from a common usage, which extended back to the very earliest period of Christianity, and was regarded as carrying with it in some way the sanction of Apostolical authority. Here the evidence for the point in hand is not simply full, but absolutely overwhelming. The ancient Liturgies turn throughout upon three main points, Consecration, Oblation, Communion; and "all these acts make that which is *done* to and through the elements the prominent consideration, and contemplate them as the medium through which the blessing is communicated. This lies on the face of the service, in every case, from beginning to end. All goes on the assumption of a real transaction

in the consecration of the elements of the most awfully solemn kind, by which they are taken to be afterwards, by the transforming power of the Holy Ghost, the mystery of Christ's actually present Humanity, his broken Body and his shed Blood, exhibited on the altar for the purposes of the Christian salvation. To this one thought these old Liturgies owe all their solemnity and sense. Without it they can neither be understood nor respected. This gone, all becomes mummary indeed and sounding bombast of the poorest and most tasteless kind. But secondly, we have in addition to this form of evidence, distinct statements, numerous and full, on the part of the ancient ecclesiastical writers, directly affirming that in the view of the early Church the elements were considered to be so changed by consecration, as to be themselves afterwards the outward form strictly and truly of the gift they represented, and the very medium of its communication. To this must be added, in the third place, the evidence comprehended in the known usages of the ancient Church with regard to the consecrated elements, plainly implying that they were regarded universally in this light. Such were the practice of sending the elements from one congregation to another as a sign of intercommunion, the practice of carrying them to those who were debarred from attending public worship, the custom of reserving them for subsequent use, the view which assumed that Christ communicated himself as a whole in every portion of the elements, the habit of receiving them fasting, with all the other demonstrations of profound reverence and respect which had regard to them immediately in the solemnity of the Eucharist. Altogether for the particular point here in consideration, and so far as the argument from antiquity is allowed to be of any force, the proof is complete. The Church in the first ages undoubtedly understood our Lord's words of institution, as we have them in the New Testament, to mean that the elements used in the Holy Eucharist, in virtue of what they are made to be by consecration, really include and convey the supernatural gift they are employed to express.

So much for the *subject*, in the words of institution, that to

which in his own hands originally our Lord applied the term "This"—the bread and the wine, namely, not in their common and general character, but as made to be mystically, then and there, by his benediction, the outward, visible form of a higher invisible reality. And what now is it which is affirmed of this subject in the way of *predicate*? The answer is plain: "My Body—My Blood." Here we come, accordingly, to a new section of our author's argument, in which he endeavors to show that the gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist is the presence of Christ through the medium of his humanity. So much would seem to be implied at once by the words of institution; for what can be signified by the Body and Blood of Christ, if they express not his proper living Manhood, what he became, and what he still continues to be, in virtue of his Incarnation. The presence spoken of cannot be taken, of course, to exclude his Godhead; where his Humanity is, there must his Divinity be also in full reality; but it is emphatically by means of his Manhood, as such, in this case, that the presence of his whole person is represented as taking effect. When Rationalists tell us, that this is a hard saying, and not to be believed, because they see not how or why the Body of Christ should be communicated to men in this way, they do but repeat in fact the infidelity of those who formerly at Capernaum, when our Lord insisted upon the necessity of eating his body and drinking his blood, "went back and walked no more with him." We have no right to say that the thing is impossible; for how little do we know of the nature of material substance, or of the qualities and properties it may be brought to assume in such an order of life as that to which it is advanced in the glorification of Christ? And just as little right have we to pretend that the thing is improbable; unless we choose to go the full length of such rationalistic scepticism, and call in question, for the same reason, the entire fact of the Incarnation. This mystery itself implies that the Humanity of Christ is the instrument and medium of our salvation. So too it is everywhere represented to be in the Scriptures. He is exhibited as the Second Adam—the Principle thus of a new human

creation, in which it is made possible for men to be redeemed and saved from the universal ruin which has come upon the race through its comprehension in the First Adam. He himself plainly teaches, that this redemption is effected by an actual incorporation, in some way, with his Flesh and Blood, answerable to the participation we all have naturally in that Adamic life which is under the curse. Why then should it be said, that the idea of a real communication of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist is incredible? It falls in exactly with the whole mystery of the Gospel. It carries out the purpose for which the Word became Flesh. And when the appeal is made here again to the judgment of the ancient Church, it is found to be unanimous, as before, in favor of just this construction of what the Scriptures teach on the subject, to the exclusion of every other.

Next comes the question concerning the sense which is to be attached to the copula, by which subject and predicate are joined together in the words of institution, "This *is* my Body," and again, "This *is* my Blood." What is the relation, in other words, which is here affirmed to hold between the gift bestowed in the Eucharist and the elements, between the outward and inward sides of this august and mysterious Sacrament? Our author declares it to be that of sacramental identity, as distinguished from all mere representation. The outward and inward, the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*, as they are distinguished by St. Augustine, are by the act of consecration, united into a compound whole. This union is not physical. It has no parallel under any other form; and hence, as altogether peculiar in its kind, it requires a peculiar name. Still it is *not* on this account any the less real. "The two things are so united, that they must needs go together; and whoso receives the one, receives the other. So long as we remain in the region of the senses, and take account only of that which is visible to the outward world, the *sacramentum* is all which we know of; but judge of the matter by faith and revelation, and we are sure that the *res sacramenti* is present also." Such being the principle then, of the Holy Eucharist, it fol-

lows "that the complete idea of this sacrament implies, not only the maintenance of the two portions of which this whole is composed, but the law of their combination" also; and hence there is room for four errors with regard to it, which it is necessary to watch against and avoid. The true nature of the sacrament may be overthrown, by omitting either the outward or the inward part of it altogether, or by so confusing or so dividing them as to destroy the necessary form of their union. To suppose the Body of Christ present in the Eucharist under the same natural conditions which attached to it when it was upon earth, would be to set aside virtually the outward side of the mystery, and thus to fall in fact into the notion of the Capernaïtes, that he intended his Flesh to be distributed to men as natural food. Just the contrary of this is the Zuinglian error, by which the *res sacramenti* or inward reality is made to be nothing, and the ordinance turned into a purely outward formality. The other two forms of error, the undue confusion of the two parts of the sacrament on the one side, and their undue separation on the other, are represented respectively, as Archdeacon Wilberforce supposes, by Luther and Calvin. Luther's principle of justification by sheer faith stood in the way of his acknowledging any real efficacy in the means of grace; and hence, while he persisted in asserting the old idea of the real presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper, it became in his system something which carried with it no such force at all of its own for the purposes of man's sanctification, as had been ascribed to it before. This was to divest the reality of its true significance, and to deal with it as though it had been still an emblem only, confusing thus the functions of the outward sign and the inward grace. The theory of Calvin, on the other hand, is charged with so distinguishing the two, in accommodation to his doctrine of election, as to destroy their sacramental coherence, overthrowing in this way the purpose of the ordinance. In distinction from these four errors, the true relation in the case is, according to our author, such a sacramental identity as implies that the *sacramentum*, or outward sign, is the medium through which the *res sacramen-*

ti, or inward reality, is communicated ; which is the same thing as to affirm that the Real Presence of Christ is bestowed through the consecrated elements. Such a Presence the Lutheran scheme allows, as does also that Capernaïtic view which invests it with a carnal or physical character ; while the false and distorted forms in which they set the doctrine, are of themselves sufficient to set aside the systems without any farther refutation. The notion of Luther is so partial and self-contradictory, that it has found, Wilberforce thinks, few genuine supporters. It is over against the other two conceptions, then, of a merely *Symbolical* Presence, as taught by Zuinglius, and of a simply *Virtual* Presence, as here supposed to be taught by Calvin, that the work before us proceeds to establish the doctrine of a *Real* Presence as this has now been defined ; proper pains being taken still farther to guard against mistake, by urging beforehand these two necessary qualifications : first, that the Presence in question is supernatural altogether, and not natural ; and secondly, that it is sacramental only and in no respect sensible. It holds in an order of things above nature, and is not subject to the conditions of space and form. It cannot be reached by the senses, but only by the mind through the exercise of faith.

Is full justice done here, however, it may be asked, to the system of Calvin ? It is admitted by our author himself, " that he did not suppose the Holy Eucharist to be merely an occasion on which God bestowed the general succors of grace, but that he asserted it to carry along with it a specific and peculiar blessing, namely, that relation to Christ which results from oneness with his glorified Humanity." Again : " It might be supposed that he entered into the relation between this sacrament and the reconstruction of mankind through Christ ; and that he accepted St. Cyril's statements, that the Humanity of our Lord is the appointed medium through which spiritual blessings are conferred upon his brethren. A far deeper man than Zuinglius, he saw that the re-creation of mankind must be based upon that supernatural system of events which had its commencement in the Incarnation of the Second Adam ;

more clear-sighted than Luther, he discriminated accurately between the inward gift and the outward sign." As Eve and her posterity proceeded from Adam's side, he tells us after St. Augustine, so the Church and her children are derived from the side of the Man Christ; whose Flesh, accordingly, is the reservior of all life for his people, of which all must participate in order that they may have part in the benefits of his redemption. The Lord's Supper involves thus a real communication with Christ's Body. This is not at hand in any carnal or local way. It is exhibited in its virtue or essential power. By this he did not mean a virtual exhibition, certainly, as distinguished from an actual, but one rather that comprehended in it the full force and living substance of Christ's proper Humanity, as it now reigns gloriously exalted at the right hand of God. Only the mode of the exhibition or presentation must be considered to transcend all the conditions of nature. It holds, not in the sphere of nature, but in the sphere of the Spirit. But it is not right to say then, as Wilberforce does, that "Calvin substituted the intervention of the Spirit, instead of the efficacy of our Lord's Body, as the true *res sacramenti*, by which a relation is brought about between God and man." The Spirit with him is but the supernatural element as distinguished from the world of sense, in which the mystery of the sacramental participation takes place. Lifted into this reign of grace and power, the process is supposed to be at once beyond the objection drawn from distance. In the sphere of the Spirit, things at a distance from each other may be made to come really together—incomprehensibly, of course, for the natural understanding, but not therefore incredibly for faith. Whether this be said to be by the lifting up of the soul to Christ, or by the coming down of his virtue to the soul, comes in the theory just to the same thing; for both forms of speech are figurative only, borrowed by necessity from the relations of nature to express a fact which is supernatural, and in regard to which no such local relations are considered to have place. Outward and inward meet here, in a way above all sense or understanding, by the wonder-work-

ing agency of the Holy Ghost. But this agency, as just said, is not itself the life-giving virtue of the sacrament. Calvin made the *res sacramenti* to be really and truly the Body of Christ, acting by its own objective force where the necessary conditions were at hand, and not simply through the mind of the worshipper. To say that the action is not truly that of Christ's Body because it is represented as taking effect by the intervention of the Spirit, is but to say, that it is not so because it is represented as having place in an order of things which is supernatural—the very thing which our author himself finds it necessary continually to assert. True, the inward part of the mystery, with Calvin, is not allowed to be inherent in any way in the elements, and so it cannot be said to be received along with them by the ungodly; but it was none the less certainly joined, for this reason, with the transaction. The *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*, in his system, come together truly in the service as a whole; so that while the believer takes part in the outward side of this, the inward side of it is considered as actually exhibited also for His use, by the power of the Holy Ghost—although out of that immediate transaction the symbols include in themselves no such supernatural relation. That the inward or visible reality, the virtue of Christ's Body, takes effect only on believers, according to the theory, cannot be said to contradict the idea of its objective presence in this mystical and supernatural view; for in any case, as our author himself admits, it is necessary to distinguish between the *res sacramenti* and the *virtus sacramenti*, "the effect which follows from Christ's Presence where there is a living relation between him and the soul;" and this distinction being made, Calvin would have had no difficulty, if we understand him rightly, in granting the actual exhibition of the *res sacramenti* in the Eucharist, as he took it, in the case even of those who are without faith. He compares this very case in fact with the falling of rain upon stones and rocks, which does not cease to be rain because it is followed there with no such effect as when it descends upon genial soil; and in another place says expressly, that however the want of faith

may shut out the benefit for unworthy communicants, nothing still fails from the nature of the sacrament, because "the bread is always the true pledge of Christ's flesh and the wine of his blood and there remains always a true exhibition of each on the part of God, (*vera utriusque exhibitio semper constat ex parte Dei.*") The virtue of the sacrament, that by which it takes effect on the worshipper, his system confines to the elect, and to these in a state of grace. But this is not just to "put the intention of Almighty God," as Archdeacon Wilberforce tells us, "in place of the *res sacramenti*, or actual gift." It merely comes to this, that those who by their faith make room for its efficacious action in themselves do so by an ability, which they owe to God's election. The immediate condition of the benefit, subjectively considered, is still the same that Wilberforce himself makes it, namely, a right state of mind on the part of the communicant, whatever cause may be assigned for this back of the thing itself; and it is not easy to see certainly why this limitation should be taken to destroy the reality of the gift, objectively considered, in the one case, any more than it may be supposed to destroy it under the same view in the other.

We readily grant, however, at the same time, that Calvin's theory of election and reprobation does not fall in logically with the idea of sacramental grace, and that the two forms of thinking, therefore, cannot stand permanently in friendly connection. The Calvinistic theology carried in itself in this way a serious dualism, which could not fail to be followed in the course of time by the depression of one of these interests in favor of the other. In most sections of the Reformed Church, accordingly, the scheme of divinity which rests on the dogma of an Absolute decree as its principle, has gradually thrust aside Calvin's view of the Sacraments as being what Dr. Hodge calls "an uncongenial foreign element," that did not cohere with the true life of the system. The course of things, however, in the Reformed Church of Germany shows, that the elimination might be also the other way; since the doctrine of the Sacraments has so far prevailed with what passes for Calvin-

ism there as to hold at bay continually the dogma of the Decrees. We do not see that Calvin's theory of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, has any necessary dependence on his theory of Predestination. It ought not, therefore, to be so joined with this, that both must be considered to stand or fall together.

Whether, under any circumstances, the theory can sustain itself, is another question. All we demur to here, is the judgment by which it is set down as affirming a simply Virtual Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in the sense of this book of Archdeacon Wilberforce—such a Presence as resolves itself at last into a mere Divine intention. As related to the *transaction*, the inward reality which Calvin maintained was, we think, much more than this; it comprehended Christ's very Body itself under an objective form. This our author will be ready to say, is such a view as cannot stand without the conception of such a relation of the *res sacramenti* to the elements, and not simply to the transaction, as must involve what he himself takes to be the necessary form of a Real Presence, in the sense of the ancient Church, as distinguished from such a Presence as is either Symbolical only or at least Virtual; and as Calvin, we know, did not allow any such relation, his theory must be considered as falling short of this distinction at last, and so sinking to the character which is here assigned to it, there being no middle ground in truth on which it is possible for any theory to stand. Here, however, the inquiry comes up, on the other side, whether there be any real middle ground between this view of Calvin and the doctrine in full of the Council of Trent. Can the essential points of what was the original faith of the Christian world in regard to the mystery of the Holy Eucharist be so carried out in any other point, (if this may not be considered satisfactory,) that it shall not be found necessary to yield here in the end all that forms any fair matter of dispute with the Catholic Church? We fear not.

Be all this as it may, however, it cannot be said to affect the force of our author's argument, as he goes on in the work before us, to assert points which, according to his view, entered into the original faith of the Church on the subject in question,

and endeavors to establish both from Scripture and from Christian Antiquity, the doctrine of a Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Holy Eucharist, as a mystery made to have place by priestly consecration in the elements themselves, in such sense that it may be said actually to exist and abide in these objectively as its proper outward form.

In the prosecution of this argument, special stress is laid upon the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which is held to be of classical authority for the proper explanation of other passages in the New Testament referring to this sacrament. Then, agreeably to the plan of discussion originally proposed in the work, an appeal is made to the testimony of the early Church, for the purpose of showing how the sense thus attributed to the Scriptures is confirmed by the judgment of the whole Christian world, in those first ages when the heritage of doctrine was still fresh and this judgment entitled to the greatest respect.

And here, on the field of historical inquiry, the argument must be allowed, we think, to be unanswerably full and triumphant. Make of the matter what we may, it is shown most conclusively that the view taken of the Eucharist by the ancient Church was such, as clearly to exclude, in the first place, the conception of a merely Symbolical or merely Virtual Presence, and then just as clearly to involve and positively affirm, in the second place, the fact of a Real Presence. The difficulty in such an argument, as Wilberforce remarks, is not to find testimonies, but to set them in any order that may be fairly answerable to the richness of the field from which they are taken. "The Holy Eucharist was so constantly present to the thoughts of the early Christians, that the references to it in their writings are almost innumerable." These are often direct, but far more frequently indirect, and in the form of general and passing allusion. Much of the evidence can be fully felt only in its connections. In this way it comes up from different sides, and under different modifications, the variety adding force to the unity, and showing the subject to be woven into the very life of the religious system to which it belonged. To

bring out this consent of antiquity, made luminous and strong by the very diversities under which it appears, the theology of the first seven centuries is exhibited as passing through five different forms or schools, in each of which a different relation to the mystery of the Eucharist prevailed, producing as many various ways of referring to it, while yet it is plain that through all these distinctions the fundamental idea with regard to it remained always the same. The Ante Nicene Period is distinguished for its unreasoning acquiescence simply in the fact of the Real Presence, as something about which all Christians are supposed as a matter of course to be agreed. Next, in the Period following the Council of Nice, we have the Eastern Scheme directing reflection, more than had been done before, to the change effected in the elements by consecration. Then the Anti Nestorian and Anti Eutychian Schools, guarding against wrong to either the outward part of the sacrament on one side, or to its inward part on the other. Finally, the Western School is found uniting the views of the other form, and giving to the doctrine thus a more scientific and comprehensive form. All these schools agree in holding the fact of a real communication of Christ's Body and Blood, through the consecrated elements of the Eucharist. It comes up as a first principle in their theological reasoning. It entered into all their public worship. Every Liturgy involves it from beginning to end. It lies in the view that was taken of consecration. Two general criteria especially may be taken as perfectly conclusive on the subject. Religious reverence and worship were held to be due to the Presence in the elements; and the Body and Blood of Christ were supposed to be orally received through them, even by unworthy communicants. Where these ideas prevail, there can be no question but that the mystery of a Real Presence in the elements, and not merely in the transaction, is regarded as being the essential character of the sacrament. The reservation of the elements for subsequent use implies also the same thing.

But now along with this idea of Christ's Real Presence, as it prevailed in the mind of the ancient Church, goes by a sort

of logical necessity another thought, namely, that the Holy Eucharist is to be considered a *sacrifice* as well as a sacrament; and one of the most important parts of the work before us, accordingly, (whatever we may think of the matter itself,) is that in which the doctrine and belief of the first ages, in regard to this subject, are brought into view. We will not pretend here to follow the evidence. We only say that as to the *fact* there can be no doubt. The Church in the first ages held universally that the Christian ministry was a real priesthood; that the so-called altar at which it served was an altar in truth and not simply in name; that a real offering was made upon it in the solemnity of the Eucharist; that this offering was nothing less than the body of Christ there present in the consecrated elements; that in this form the One Sacrifice of the Cross ("once for all" or of perennial force,) was exhibited continually before God for the sins of men; that the shadows of the Jewish Temple had thus their corresponding reality in the "pure offering" of the Christian Church (Mal. 1: 11;) and that the making of this sacrifice formed in truth the main work and carried with it the main worth and power of the sacred ministry, as it was emphatically the *λειτουργία* also, the true liturgy or service of the Church in all its solemn assemblies. Such is the simple historical fact. In what light it is to be regarded, or what use is to be made of it theologically, is of course another matter altogether.

With Archdeacon Wilberforce, however, the voice of antiquity is allowed to be conclusive in favor of the doctrine; and one object which he proposes to himself in his book, is the restoration of this aspect of the sacrament, and the revival of it as a daily service, in the Church of England. In following out this design, it is assumed that the English Episcopal Church is fairly and truly the continuation of the Catholic Church of the first ages, and that it carries in itself still all the provisions which are needed for giving effect to the sacramental theory here brought into view; whilst at the same time it is admitted that there has been a vast departure from it practically since the time of the Reformation. This departure, it is contended,

however, is against the true genius of the Church, and must not be so laid to its charge as to be considered a part of its normal form and order. In this respect it is taken to be in a different condition from the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the continent; which by casting off Episcopacy are supposed to have broken radically with the constitution of the Church as it stood before, and so to have lost altogether the power of correcting and restoring subsequently their own aberrations from the faith and practice of the first Christian ages. We have here, in other words, the well known Anglican or Tractarian theory of ecclesiastical legitimacy, of which so much was heard a few years since in connection with the University of Oxford, and on which much stress has been laid by some in this country also as a sufficient warrant for the pretensions of the Episcopal Church, over against all other Christian bodies both Catholic and Protestant.

We do not propose, in the present article, to enter at all into the merits of the main subject, considered as a question of actual theology for Protestantism as it now stands. That would be a task too large altogether for the limits to which we are here confined, even if we had the ability and the heart to undertake it; which we confess that we have not. We feel the difficulties of the subject, without having courage to attempt their solution. Let others, more competent for the service, put their hand to this work. We offer here no theory, we have no scheme to explain or defend. All we aim at, is to urge attention to the subject, to press facts, to set home the problem which calls for an answer, and to make clear the necessary conditions of its solution. Let no one say, that this can be of no use. The interest which is here at stake is so very important, that it is not possible to go too far in urging attention to it, independently of every particular theory or scheme that may be exhibited for its explanation. The facts of the case challenge our most solemn regard, in whatever light they may be viewed; and a properly awakened interest in them for their own sake, may be considered indeed the first necessary requisition for doing any sort of justice to the claims of the great

theological question to which they belong. Indifferentism and obscurantism are the two things which need most of all to be overcome, in order that there may be any chance of having these claims rightly met. What is most worthy of sorrowful lamentation, is the habit of mind, (exemplified on all sides,) by which the subject is either held to be of no serious practical account, or else is passively taken to have its full and sufficient exposition in some vague hypothesis, at war both with history and logic, the unreality of which is not seen only because there is not honesty enough nor energy enough to subject it to any truly earnest examination. How much would be gained for our theology, and for our religious life too, if only this dream, this spell of the inward senses, could be effectually dissolved, and things were made to appear in their own true and proper light !

In such general view it is, as we have said before, that we consider it a privilege to call attention to this "*Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*" by Archdeacon Wilberforce, without pretending either to endorse its conclusions, (that we could not do fully indeed without bowing in form to the claims of the Episcopal Church,) or to set up in the way of criticism any opposing or divergent view of our own. We have read the work with more than usual interest. It is eminently worthy of attention. The author occupies the highest rank as an English theologian. No one can dispute the learning of the treatise, nor its general ability. It breathes throughout also the most excellent spirit. The facts it presents are of universal significance and concern. Its theme is one, the importance of which it is not easy to exaggerate, as related especially to the circumstances and wants of the Christian world at the present time.

It is written indeed immediately for Anglicans or Episcopalians. But so far as the main subject is concerned, it has to do with what should be considered a vital and fundamental interest for all Protestant denominations. For Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, and others, whether it be felt or not, there is no more momentous inquiry at this

time than that which regards the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, looked at in the historical and theological relations which are here brought into view. We hazard nothing in saying, that the other subjects of discussion and debate with which these bodies are exercised, so far as there is any care for theology still left, are of far less consequence than this, involving as it does undoubtedly at last all the issues of the Church Question, back to its very source in the mystery of the Incarnation. Not to be alive and awake to the claims of theology in this view, is to be asleep with regard to them in every direction besides, mistaking dreams for realities and abstractions for living concrete facts. New England itself must yet come to see this, if Christianity be not doomed to run itself out there into a barren heath. If her theology is to be saved from starvation and inanition, it must pass beyond the questions which have heretofore engrossed its metaphysical digestion, the *loci communes* of Andover and New-Haven, and grapple earnestly with the questions which enter into what it is now too prone magisterially to waive aside under the title of the Church system, as something at war with evangelical religion and fit only for Puseyites and Catholics. We do not say that it must become either Catholic or Anglican. But it must learn to have some idea of the Church, some faith in the mystery of the Holy Sacraments, some sympathy with the mind of the universal Church with regard to them in the first ages, some sense of the necessity there is for a true historical reconciliation, in some way, between the Christianity of those first ages in this view and what is known as Protestant Christianity at the present time. The day for ignoring and despising these points, is fast coming to an end. The best men in New England are beginning to see and feel it. God grant that they may see and feel it more and more.

Whatever theory any may see fit to adopt in regard to the subject for themselves, there is a common obligation on all to understand and acknowledge at least, as a single fact of history, the view that was actually taken of the Eucharist by the ancient Church. It can never be right to mix up what is pure-

ly historical here with what is theological, in such a way as to confound the one with the other. In this work of Wilberforce, for instance, we have two general things, which, however closely they are joined in this argument, need notwithstanding to be kept continually distinct in the mind of the reader; his own scheme, namely, of Anglican divinity, and the historical premises from which he reasons in what he supposes to have been the faith and practice of the Church in the first ages. These premises are one consideration; the conclusions drawn from them are entirely another. To quarrel with the first, merely because we may happen to dislike the first, must be considered eminently absurd. Now it is of these historical premises or data, in the present case, we make the declaration, that they seem to us to be, as to all material points, faithfully represented in the book before us, and that this being so, they give it an interest and importance which all should feel to reach far beyond the range of its own immediate argument. This we may explode, if we please, as theological Puseyism or Popery; but there still are the facts of history, or what at least claim to be such, which refuse to be exploded in any like summary style. Calling nick-names and starting bugbears here, can answer no purpose. The facts remain just what they were before. No theory can set them aside. The universal Church in the first ages saw in the Holy Eucharist the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood; they were supposed to be made present in the elements by priestly consecration; the service became in this way a sacrifice of thanksgiving and propitiation embodying in itself continually the full value of the offering made on Calvary for the sins of men; all was held to be an awful and sublime mystery, in which was comprehended day after day the objective force of the whole Christian worship, as the full counterpart or antitype in substance of all that had place as type and shadow in the sacrifices of the ancient law. What shall we say to this? To deny it successfully, as mere matter of history, is out of the question. To say that it does not concern us, is both stupid and profane. It does concern us deeply and seriously. We are bound to see and own the

truth ; to bring it home distinctly to our mind ; to come to some right understanding with it, if possible, in our thinking and in our faith.

Shall we set the whole fact down for a delusion, an open falling away from the true sense and purpose of Christianity as we have this presented to us in the pages of the New Testament ? See then how much this must involve. It is no mere circumstance that is here at stake. We have to do with something which goes to the very heart and core of the ancient faith. The whole theology of the early Church is conditioned by this view of the Eucharist. It forms the soul of its worship, the animating principle of its entire religious life. The doctrine is woven inseparably into the texture of its universal practice and belief. To pronounce it then absolutely false, is at once to turn all the Christianity of these first ages into a lie ; for their error here, if it were such, is so vast and deep, as to leave no room for the least confidence in their system of thinking under any other view. It is only mockery and hypocrisy to talk of respecting and following the Church of these first days in anything else, if we make it radically wrong in that which formed, as the mystery of the Holy Eucharist did, the grand burden of its creed and worship. To be consistent, we must consign that whole Christianity to Satan, and disown in full the fellowship of the fathers, martyrs, and saints, who dreamed of being carried by it in their day to heaven. Are we prepared for that ? Not surely, if we have not lost our spiritual senses. Faith, Hope, Charity, all cry out against such an act of ecclesiastical *felo-de-se*. Infidelity and heresy only have a right to be thus desperately mad.

Can it be pretended then, that we have anywhere among our Protestant denominations, at the present time, this old theory and practice in regard to the Eucharist, still existing and in full force ? For the most part, the answer is very easy. The fact of a very considerable difference between the ancient view and that which these denominations now generally hold, is too plain and palpable to allow a moment's mistake. They avow very distinctly themselves quite another way of looking at

the subject, and have no wish to identify their doctrine with this Patristic scheme. Anglicanism, however, as represented in the able work which has called forth the present article, affects to occupy a different position, and to be truly one still, not in substance merely, but in actual form, with the Church of antiquity, in its doctrine of the Sacraments as well as at other points. Is the pretension properly sustained? We think not. This construction of Archdeacon Wilberforce, however well it may be put together, is not in reality the doctrine or practice of the Episcopal Church either in England or in this country. It will not be so accepted on either side of the Atlantic; for the satisfaction which a certain class may find in it as a merely private entertainment, is something very different from the mind and meaning of the denomination as such. The points of a real bodily presence above nature in the elements, of this as something abiding and not restricted to the immediate service of the communion itself, and of the power of a real sacrifice in the transaction for the sins of men, however they may find some slender hold to hang upon in the confused beginnings of the English system, and the shelter of some slight authority from the views of a few of its bishops and divines since, (views generally in the *wilderness*,) are yet too alien from the reigning make and genius of the Church altogether, to allow the supposition that they can ever be practically ingrafted into its life. In this country, just now especially, the Episcopal communion is in such a state of general self-compromise with regard to all such points, that the grand Apostolic word, "We believe and therefore speak," is about the last thing concerning them that one expects to hear fall from its lips. If there is to be a real lineal connection here between Protestantism and the faith of the ancient Church, this fond dream of Anglicanism will not answer. It must be shown to hold in some wider view and under some different form.

In these circumstances it is, that the theory of Calvin, if it can be maintained, would seem to be after all most truly conformed to the wants and conditions of the problem which requires to be solved, aiming as it does to mediate between the

difficulties of the case as it actually stands on both sides. On the one hand it seeks to avoid Zuinglianism, which by stultifying all antiquity stultifies and kills itself; while on the other it pretends to no such identification with the past, as leaves no room for Protestantism to stand upon in its distinction from the Roman Catholic Church. It asserts, accordingly, a real participation of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist as a transaction; but denies their presence in the elements, and owns in the mystery no sacrifice. In these points it differs from the doctrine of the ancient Church. But must it not so differ, in order to be Protestant? The only question is, whether the difference be essential or simply accidental—the destruction of oneness and sameness absolutely, or such an outward diversity only as may resolve itself fairly into the laws of historical development and growth. And this is the question then for Protestantism as a whole interest; for as we have said before, there is no true middle position anywhere, as it seems to us, between the view of Calvin and the full dogma of the Catholic Church. If this Calvinistic doctrine, as we have it for instance in the Heidelberg Catechism, be not able to stand, it is not easy to see certainly how Protestantism itself can stand, as such, and keeping strictly to its own lines, unless as at open war with the whole faith that lives enshrined in the Liturgies of the Ancient Church.

Mercersburg, Pa.

J. W. N.

ART. II.—LITURGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

NO. 1.

BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

A. INFANT BAPTISM.

[Baptism shall be performed in the church, before or after the regular service, except in cases of urgent necessity. The water being provided and put into the Font, or some other clean vessel, fit and decent for the sacred ordinance, the minister shall begin thus:]

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Grace be with you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

[Then, after the singing of a suitable hymn, the minister shall address the congregation:]

Dearly Beloved! Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, after His resurrection and shortly before His ascension to the right hand of God the Father Almighty, instituted the holy sacrament of Baptism for the remission of sins, saying to His disciples according to the gospel of St. Matthew, in the twenty-eighth chapter: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Hear also what is written by St. Mark in the tenth chapter of his gospel: The Jews "brought children" to Christ "that He should touch them," and His disciples rebuked those who brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased and said unto them: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you: Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them and blessed them."

You see from these words and actions of our blessed Saviour, that He would have all men without distinction of sex or age to be baptized, and so to be introduced into the gracious covenant of the triune God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, that they may have part in its privileges, fulfil its duties and obtain finally its everlasting rewards. For He is a Saviour of all classes and conditions of man. He became a child to sanctify our childhood; a youth to sanctify our youth, and a man to sanctify our manhood. You see, moreover, how He commands especially little children to be brought unto Him, how He rebukes those that would have kept them away, how readily He blesses them, how kindly He embraces them, how He

pronounces them capable of, and entitled to the kingdom of God, how He exhorts us all to receive this kingdom as little children, and declares that no man can enter therein except by being like them in simplicity, humility, and trust. As it was required under the Old Testament that all infants eight days old should be circumcised, the promise being given to Abraham and his seed : so it is right and meet and in accordance with the divine will as well as with the practice of the holy catholic Church in all ages, that all children of Christian parents should receive the sign and the seal of the New Covenant which is far more comprehensive than the Old, and thus be dedicated from their earliest days to the service of the triune God and brought into a saving relation to Christ. And although infants have not committed any actual transgressions, yet are they born in sin and involved in the fall of Adam, our first parent, and must die in consequence of sin. Hence must they also be born again of water and of the Spirit, to enter into the kingdom of God. For "what is born of the flesh, is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit, is Spirit."

Therefore, firmly believing the gracious promises of God which He on His part will most surely keep and perform, and relying on the power of His Holy Spirit, which like the wind bloweth where it listeth, so that we hear the sound thereof but cannot tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth : let us commend this child (*these children*) to the grace of God, and humbly and devoutly pray in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He may receive (*him, her, them*) into His covenant of grace and holiness as a member (*members*) of Christ's mystical body of the Church, and to this effect send down His Holy Spirit upon the water of baptism that it may become to this child (*these children*) a laver of regeneration and a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Let us pray. (*Kneeling.*)

Almighty God our Heavenly Father, who hast created this child, (*these children*) for thy glory, be pleased graciously to make him (*her, them*) Thine also, by adoption that he (*she, they*) may grow up in Thy fear and serve Thee in true righteousness

and holiness all the days of his (*her, their*) life. O Lord God Jesus Christ, who in the days of Thy flesh didst take little children into Thine arms and bless them, and who didst more-over shed Thy precious blood for them on the cross, mercifully receive also this child (*these children*) and engraft him (*her, them*) into Thy body, the Church, that he (*she, they*) may be Thine forever both in body and soul, in life and in death. O God the Holy Ghost, who camest down from heaven upon Jesus at His baptism on the banks of Jordan, descend also upon this child, (*these children*,) wash away his (*her, their*) sin, regenerate his (*her, their*) heart, that he (*she, they*) may become Thy temple and be filled with thy graces according to the promise given to us and to our children, even to as many as the Lord God shall call. O holy, blessed and glorious Trinity, Three persons and one God, bestow Thy rich favor upon this child, (*these children*,) grant unto him (*her, them*) true faith, ardent love and firm hope, send thy guardian angels to keep watch over him (*her, them*) day and night, fortify him (*her, them*) against the temptations of the flesh, the world and the devil, lead him (*her, them*) safe through the trials and tribulations of life, and after having served Thee faithfully on earth take him (*her, them*) up at last into the enjoyment of Thy glory in heaven to praise Thee with angels and saints forever and ever. Amen.

Our Father, etc.

Or this :

Almighty and everlasting God, who of Thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark by water ; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, Thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby Thy holy baptism ; and by the baptism of Thy well beloved Son, Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin : we beseech Thee for thine infinite mercies, graciously to look upon this child, (*these children*) to wash him, (*her, them*) and sanctify him (*her, them*) with the Holy Ghost, that he (*she, they*) being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and being steadfast in faith, joyful through

hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he (*she, they*) may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with Thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Our Father, etc.

[Then the minister shall address the parents or sponsors as follows:]

Dearly beloved, you have brought this child to be offered to Christ by holy baptism as a servant of His laws and a disciple of His doctrine; you have prayed, that God would receive *him* and make *him* a member of His everlasting kingdom. You have heard also what promises God hath made on His part, which are yea and amen, and not one tittle of which shall pass unaccomplished. But you must remember also, that baptism which is a covenant of grace on the side of God, is also a covenant of obedience on the side of man, that God who offers us first His blessings, requires also from us repentance and faith, that His ordinances may prove unto us a savor of life unto life, and not of death unto death. Therefore, you to whose care and responsibility this child is committed, must also on *his* behalf, as *his* surities, until *he* become of age to take it upon *himself*, faithfully promise to fulfil the conditions of this covenant of mercy, to renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil, to believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and to keep all Christ's commandments.

I ask you then in the presence of God and of this congregation:

Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce the devil with all his ways and works, the world with its vain pomp and glory, and the flesh with all its sinful desires?

Answer. I renounce them all.

Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?

Answer. I believe.

Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ His only begotten Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, descended into hell; the third day He arose again

from the dead, ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead?

Answer. I believe.

Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic Church, The communion of saints, The remission of sins, The resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting?

Answer. I believe.*

Wilt thou that this child be baptized in this faith?

Answer. I will.

Dost thou solemnly promise to bring up this child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and in the doctrines and duties of our holy religion?

Answer. I do.

[Then the minister taking the child into his arms shall say to the parents or sponsors: *name this child*, and naming it after them aloud shall baptize it,† saying:]

N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.‡

Let us give thanks:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we render Thee our

* According to some ancient rituals these three questions concerning the Christian faith may also be condensed into one, in this wise:

Dost thou believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost and in all the articles of the Christian faith as contained in the Apostle's Creed?

Answer. I believe.

In the Churches of the East, it was customary for the person to be baptized or the sponsor, to repeat the creed after the minister, instead of answering to questions.

† The application of water ought to be plentiful, and may be repeated as each name of the Holy Trinity is pronounced.

‡ The first Zwinglian (of 1523, Zw. Opera, ed. Schuler, II, 2, p. 226,) the Lutheran and the Anglican Liturgies, as well as those of the ancient Greek and Roman Churches, attach to this act the ceremony of making a cross on the child's forehead (and breast) accompanied with these or similar words:

We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock and sign him with the sign of the cross, in token, that he may hereafter fight as a faithful soldier under the banner of Christ crucified, against the world, the flesh and the devil, confess Him before men in word and in deed, and continue faithful in His service all the days of his life. Amen.

humble and most hearty thanks, that Thou hast been pleased, by holy baptism, to deliver this child (*these children*) from the power of darkness and translate *him* into the kingdom of Thy dear Son, in whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins. And we humbly beseech Thee to grant that *he*, being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in His death, may crucify the old man and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; that as *he* is made partaker of the death of Thy Son, so *he* may be also partaker of His resurrection; so that finally with the residue of Thy Holy Church, *he* may inherit finally Thine everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Or this:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we render Thee our humble and most hearty thanks, that Thou hast been pleased to grant unto this child, (*these children*) the holy sign and seal of the remission of sin and the washing of regeneration, to receive *him* as Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate *him* into the visible Church of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ. And we humbly entreat Thee, so to govern *this child* by Thy Holy Spirit that *he* may ever remain true to *his* baptismal vows, confess the name of Christ, by word and deed, fight as a faithful soldier under His banner, against all the powers of sin and darkness, and inherit at last the crown of victory and glory. Give grace unto the parents, relatives and friends of *this child*, that they may train *him* up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, instruct *him* in the way of salvation and show *him* a good example in a godly life and conversation. Remind us all who are here present, of our baptismal vows by which we were dedicated to Thy Holy service, and enable us to keep Thy law, to glorify Thy name in prosperity and adversity, in life and in death, and as Thou by Thy infinite goodness hast made us members of Thy church militant upon earth, so give us a part at last with prophets and apostles, with confessors and martyrs in the joys of thy Church triumphant in heaven. Amen.

[Then the minister shall address the parents or sponsors as follows:]

Beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ, as you have dedicated this child (*these children*) by baptism, to the service of the triune God, you must remember that it is your sacred duty to train him (*her, them*) up by precept and example, in the true knowledge and fear of God according to the articles of the Christian faith and doctrine, as contained in the books of the Old and New Testament and the symbols of the Church. Especially is it your duty, so soon as he (*she, they*) shall be able to learn, to remind him, (*her, them*) often of his (*her, their*) baptismal vows and obligations, and in particular to teach him the Lord's prayer, the Apostle's Creed and the Ten Commandments, that *he* may know how to pray, what to believe, and what to practice. Finally, you are to see to it, that *he* be brought at the proper time to the minister to be instructed in the Catechism and prepared for Confirmation and the Holy Communion, that *he* may heartily renew *his* baptismal vows, renounce in *his* own name, the world, the flesh, and the devil, profess Jesus Christ and ever honor this profession by a holy life and conversation, to the glory of God and the salvation of *his* soul.

Benediction :

The grace of our Lord, etc.

[In case of private baptism, made necessary by sickness, or any other cause, this service may be shortened, if it seem proper, at the discretion of the minister.]

B. ADULT BAPTISM.

[Adults, or persons of riper years, who are able to answer for themselves, are not to be baptized, unless they have been first carefully instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, as set forth in the Catechism, and give sufficient evidence of their hearty repentance and their sincere desire to lead a new life devoted to the service of God and His Church.]

Minister :

In the name of the Father, of the Son and the Holy Ghost.
Amen.

[After the singing of a Hymn suitable for the occasion, the minister shall address the person or persons to be baptized, as follows :

DEARLY BELOVED :

That you may know and rightly understand from God's holy word, the meaning and importance of the Sacrament of Baptism, let us hear first the gospel as recorded by St. John, in the third chapter : " There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night and said unto Him : We know that Thou art a teacher come from God ; for no man can do these miracles, that Thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him : Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus said unto him : How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born ? Jesus answered : Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee : Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth : so also is every one that is born of the Spirit. St. John, 3 : 1-8.

Hear also the words of the institution of this Sacrament, as contained in the last chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark :

" And he said unto His disciples : Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. St. Mark, 16 : 15, 16.

You see from these words of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that we are all by nature in a sinful and lost condition, and cannot enter into the kingdom of God except by a new birth of Water and of the Spirit ; and that there is no salvation without faith in Jesus Christ and a child-like submission to His ordinances. You see, moreover, that the ordinary way of entering into the covenant of grace according to God's appointment is the sacrament of holy Baptism, by which we are divinely assured of

the remission of our sins and become partakers of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Hence also St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, after preaching the gospel of Christ's death and resurrection, called upon the hearers, saying: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, For the promise is unto you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2: 38, 39.

But as the blessing is great, which God in His mercy bestows upon all, who approach this ordinance with a truly penitent heart, so also is the obligation great, which they on their part assume. Remember, that in submitting to baptism, you renounce openly before God and His Church, the world, the flesh and the devil, and dedicate yourself (*yourselves*) with body and soul to the service of the triune God, who has made you and redeemed you and sanctified you; that you are bound, therefore, by the most sacred vows, to live henceforth not unto yourself, (*yourselves*) but unto Him, who gave Himself for you, to obey Christ's commandments and to adorn your profession by a sober, righteous and godly life, until you shall appear at last before the judgment seat of Christ. Remember, that unless you comply with the conditions of God's covenant, you forfeit its privileges and glorious rewards, and that which was intended as a savor of life unto life, will turn by your own guilt into a savor of death unto death. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

[Then addressing the congregation, he shall say:]

Let us, therefore, all who are here present, humble ourselves before Almighty God, and call upon Him to grant His blessing and the influences of His Holy Spirit, that the Water of Baptism may become to this person (*these persons*) a laver of regeneration and a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Let us pray. (*Kneeling.*)

Almighty and everliving God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to Thee for succor, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead : we call upon Thee for this person (*these persons*) that he (*she, they*) coming to Thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his (*her, their*) sins by spiritual regeneration. Receive him, (*her, them*) O Lord, as Thou hast promised by Thy well beloved Son, saying : ask, and ye shall receive, seek, and ye shall find, knock, and it shall be opened unto you ; so now give unto us that ask, let us that seek find, open the gate unto us that knock ; that this person (*these persons*) may enjoy the everlasting benediction of Thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which Thou hast promised by Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty and everlasting God, who of Thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family by water, and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, Thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby Thy holy Baptism ; and by the Baptism of Thy well beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water to the mystical washing away of sin : we beseech Thee for Thine infinite mercies, graciously to look upon this Thy servant, (*these Thy servants*) to wash him, (*her, them*) and sanctify him (*her, them*) with the Holy Ghost, that he (*she, they*) being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and being steadfast, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the billows of this troublesome world, that finally he (*she, they*) may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with Thee, world without end. Amen.

Our Father, etc.

[Then the minister shall address the person or persons to be baptized :]

Dearly beloved, having heard what the holy Scriptures teach concerning the institution, the great blessings and the solemn obligations of the sacrament of Baptism, and having called upon God, to accompany the use of the same, at this time, with the power of His Spirit : I now ask you, in the presence

of God and this congregation, to answer clearly and distinctly the following questions :

Dost thou renounce the devil with all his ways and works, the world with its vain pomp and glory, and the flesh with all its sinful desires ?

Answer. I renounce them all.

Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth ?

Answer. I believe.

Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried ; He descended into hell ; the third day He arose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead ?

Answer. I believe.

Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting ?

Answer. I believe.

Wilt thou be baptized in this faith ?

Answer. I will.

Dost thou promise to follow Jesus Christ and to keep His commandments all the days of thy life ?

Answer. I do.

[Then shall the minister ask the name of the Catechumen, and requiring him to kneel down, shall baptize him saying :]

N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

[After a short pause the minister shall lay his hand on the head of the person or persons baptized, still kneeling, and CONFIRM them severally, saying :]

Defend, O Lord, Thy servant, with Thy heavenly grace, that *he* may continue Thine forever, and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until *he* come unto Thy everlasting kingdom. *Amen.*

Or this :

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who out of His infinite mercy has granted thee the remission of all thy sins and the gift of His Holy Spirit, confirm thee by His grace, strengthen thee for every good word and work unto everlasting life. *Amen.*

[Then the persons rising, the minister shall proceed:]

Let us give thanks:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we render Thee our humble and most hearty thanks, that Thou hast been pleased, by holy Baptism, to deliver this person (*these persons*) from the power of darkness, and translate *him* into the kingdom of Thy dear Son, in whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins. And we humbly beseech Thee to grant that *he*, being dead unto sin and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in His death, may crucify the old man and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that, as *he* is made partaker (*partakers*) of the death of Thy Son, *he* may also be made partaker of His resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of Thy Holy Church, *he* may be an inheritor of Thine everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Or this:

Almighty God, our most merciful Father, we render Thee our humble and hearty thanks, that Thou dost mercifully defend and daily increase Thy holy catholic Church, and that Thou hast been pleased to add this person (*these persons*) to the number of Christ's flock, granting *him* the forgiveness of sins and making *him* Thy child, and an heir of life everlasting. And we humbly beseech Thee, ever to defend us and *this Thy servant*, against the powers of sin and darkness, to strengthen us with the Holy Ghost, and daily to increase in us Thy manifold gifts of grace, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; that, walking in Thy ways and keeping Thy commandments, we may obtain at last the inheritance of the saints in light, and praise Thee, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. *Amen.*

[Then the minister shall give the person or persons baptized, the right hand and say:]

I now give you the right hand of Christian fellowship, and receive you into the congregation of Christ's flock, and admit you to all the privileges of the same. May you ever walk worthy of your high and heavenly calling, and may the God of peace sanctify you wholly and preserve your whole spirit and soul and body blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

[The minister shall then conclude the service with a hymn and the usual benediction.]

NO. 2.

THE FORM OF MARRIAGE.

[The parties to be married shall appear, standing before the minister, with their friends and neighbors or other witnesses; the Man on the right hand, and the Woman on the left. The minister shall then begin and say:]

In the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

Dearly beloved, we are assembled, in the sight of God, and of his holy angels, to join together this man and this woman in the bonds of matrimony, which is an honorable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, confirmed by the teaching of our blessed Saviour, and compared by St. Paul to the mystical union, which subsists between Christ and his Church.

Hear what the word of God says concerning it:

"And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and of the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

Hear further what is said by our Lord in the Gospel of St. Matthew :

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause ? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, 'For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they twain shall be one flesh ?' Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Hear also what St. Paul says, in his epistle to the Ephesians, as touching the duties of husbands towards their wives and of wives towards their husbands :

"Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it ; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives, as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself, for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church.

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church : and he is the Saviour of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."

Into this holy estate these two persons are come to be joined. Therefore, if any man can show any just cause why they may not be lawfully joined together, let him now speak, or forever after hold his peace.

[And then, addressing the persons to be married, he shall say :

Also, I charge you each and both, as you will answer before God at the day of judgment, if either of you know any reason why you may not be lawfully joined together in matrimony, confess it now. For be well assured, that all those who are

brought together contrary to the word of God, are not joined together of God ; neither is their marriage lawful.

[If there be no impediment alleged, or no suspicion raised, the minister shall proceed, and say unto the man :]

Wilt thou take this woman to be thy wedded wife ?

Wilt thou love her, comfort her, honor and keep her, in sickness and in health ; and forsaking every other, cleave to her only, so long as you both shall live ?

[The man shall answer :]

I will.

[Then shall he say unto the woman :]

Wilt thou take this man to be thy wedded husband ?

Wilt thou obey him and serve him, love, honor and keep him, in sickness and in health ; and, forsaking every other, cleave to him only, so long as you both shall live ?

[The woman shall answer :]

I will.

[Then shall the minister say :]

As a seal to this holy vow, give each other the right hand.

[Then shall he address these words to the bridegroom, who shall repeat them after him :]

I, M., take thee, N., to be my wedded wife, and pledge thee my troth.

[In the same way the bride shall repeat these words after him :]

I, N., take thee, M., to be my wedded husband, and pledge thee my troth.

[Then shall he lay his hand upon the hands of the pair and say :]

The marriage vow, which you have here made, before God and these witnesses, I confirm, in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen !

What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Let us pray :

O God, who by thy mighty power didst create man in thine own image, and then ordain for his happiness the estate of marriage, to be continued through all generations, look mercifully, we pray thee, upon these thy servants ; that both this

man may truly love his wife, according to thy word, and also that this woman may be loving and amiable, faithful and obedient to her husband ; and in all quietness, sobriety and peace be a follower of holy and godly matrons.

O Lord, bless them both and grant them an inheritance in thine everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation ; but deliver us from evil : for thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

[Then shall he bless them :]

Almighty God, who at the beginning did create our first parents, Adam and Eve, and did sanctify and give them in marriage, pour upon you the riches of his grace, sanctify and bless you, that you may please him both in body and soul, and live together in holy love unto your lives' end. Amen.

NO. 3.

A FORM OF SERVICE TO BE USED AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNER-STONE OF A CHURCH.

[When the people have assembled at the spot where the new church is to be built, the minister, standing near the corner-stone, shall say:]

Christian Brethren:—It is right and proper, in all our doings, to beseech Almighty God for his most gracious direction and help. But especially, as we are now assembled to begin a House, which is to be set apart for His honor and service ; for the worship of His holy name, the preaching of His holy Gospel, and the administration of His holy Sacraments, let us devoutly look up to Him for assistance, protection, and blessing.

Almighty and everlasting God, who art always more ready to hear than we are to pray, and art wont to give more than

either we desire or deserve; grant us, we beseech thee, the fulness of Thy mercy. Prosper and bless the work which we have here undertaken, that by thy favor it may promote Thy glory and secure the salvation of many souls; through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Our Father, who art, etc.

[Here the minister shall read the 96th Psalm, or some other suitable portion of Scripture.

The inscription of the stone, if it have any, shall be read, and notice given of the deposits made therein.

Then the corner-stone being laid in its place, the minister shall say:]

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

[Striking the stone three times with the hammer, he shall say:]

In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.* I lay the corner-stone of an edifice to be here erected by the name of ——— church, and devoted to the worship of Almighty God, agreeably to the principles and usages of the German Reformed Church in the United States of North America.

Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ; who is God over all, blessed forever; in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. *Amen.*

[Then shall the minister say:]

Let us pray:

Blessed be thy name, O Lord, that it hath pleased thee to put it into the hearts of thy servants to commence the erection of a building in which thy holy name is to be worshipped, the messages of reconciliation proclaimed and the means and pledges of thy grace and mercy administered. Prosper thou them, O God, in this their undertaking. Guard by thy prov-

idence everything which may appertain to the building, which is now begun in thy fear. Excite the skill and animate the industry of the superintendents and workmen. Shield them from all accidents and dangers. And grant unto them, and all of us here present, the influences of thy Divine Spirit, so that we may become in soul and body living temples of the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for that eternal city which hath foundations, whose maker and whose builder is God. All which we ask through the abundant merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

[Here an address may be delivered. After which a collection will be made and the service concluded with the singing of the 100th Psalm and Apostolic benediction.]

ART. III.—CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

IT is an encouraging fact, that amid the radical and unchurchly tendencies of the present age, the subject of *Catechising*, has of late years received increased attention on the part of all the leading branches of the Protestant Church. Not only have pastors, and professors of theology advocated in various religious publications this time-honored, and Scriptural mode of carrying forward in a healthy and vigorous form the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, but the highest ecclesiastical judicatories, have expressed anew, and with increased earnestness, their hearty confidence in this mode of inculcating divine truth, and, by the weight of their solemn authority, directed the ministers and churches under their care to prosecute the work of systematic, catechetical instruction, with increased diligence and zeal. And as the Church, to whose interests this publication is especially devoted, is emphatically a *catechetical Church*, and was thus characterized from the beginning, it has been deemed appropriate to prepare a paper on this particular department of her religious policy.

The word *chatechise*, is derived from the Greek word *κατ'ἄνω* and signifies properly to teach the rudiments, or first principles of some particular doctrine. In a more general sense, when applied to the doctrine of the Church as such, it means, to teach the first principles of the Christian religion. The word catechism, *κατ'ἄνωξις*, may be defined, *a summary of Christian doctrine, reduced to the form of questions and answers.*

The *origin* of catechising, according to the technical and proper import of the term, cannot be precisely fixed. In its more essential features and elements, however, it may be said to have obtained in the early history of the Old Testament Church. In the covenant God made with Abraham, (Gen. 17: 7,) he said, "I will be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee." And as the acceptable worship of God, presupposes as its ground and necessary condition, a competent knowledge of divine truth, God earnestly enjoined upon the Jews, the duty of catechising, or instructing their children in the doctrines of religion as then revealed. In the 12th and 13th chapters of Exodus, he expressly commands to give their children a particular explanation of the passover, its institution and design. In the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, God commands parents to repeat to their children, the entire history of the law which he had given them. And in the 6th chapter of the same book, it is solemnly enjoined upon Israel to adhere to, and love with a supreme affection the one true God, and to inculcate with persevering diligence, into the minds of their children, the precious doctrines which had been revealed to them. "*And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.*" The pious Jews, accordingly, under the Old Testament dispensation, by no means overlooked the religious education of their children. Parents not only dedicated their offspring to God in the sacrament of circumcision, but as they grew up, made them acquainted with their relations to God, and his Church, their duties and responsibilities, as well as with the

privileges and immunities involved in their peculiar and favored position. Besides, special attention was paid to the religious education of children in the schools. The schools of the prophets, it may be supposed, were not intended simply to prepare youth for the prophetic office, but offered their advantages to all who might be disposed to attend upon the instructions there imparted.

In the New Testament Church, religious training, the instruction of children and youth in the doctrines of religion, was earnestly insisted on. The blessed Redeemer himself commanded that little children should be brought to him, and laid his hands upon and blessed them. The command, "Feed my lambs," contemplated not only kind pastoral attention to such as were young in grace, but such as were young in years also. "Ye fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," was the injunction of an inspired Apostle. Timothy, a young minister of the gospel, and distinguished for his symmetrical, intelligent, and ardent piety, knew the Scriptures from a child, and by them was made wise unto salvation. And there is reason to believe, that already in the apostolic age, ministers of religion observed due order and system, in instructing children and others who were ignorant, in the doctrines of the gospel. The apostle Paul speaks of the "principles of the doctrine of Christ," some of which he proceeds to enumerate in regular order. These, he elsewhere denominates "milk for babes." It is evident, therefore, that the Apostles adapted their teachings in due order to the capacities and circumstances of those whom they engaged to instruct.

And at an early period succeeding the apostolic age, history bears ample testimony to the zeal and diligence of the Church, in carrying forward the system of catechetical instruction. Already in the second century, catechumenical schools were established in connection with almost every Christian Church. In these schools, not only the children of Christians, but the heathen also, were instructed in the doctrines of religion, and were thus prepared for full communion with the Church. Besides these parochial, Christian schools, others of a still higher character were established, where youth were more fully and

thoroughly instructed in religion. A school of this character was opened in Alexandria in the middle of the second century, and was presided over by such men as Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen, under whose government it became justly, and universally celebrated. Eusebius writes, that Origen restored the custom of catechising in Alexandria, which had been suffered to grow out of use during the times of persecution. Socrates observes, in relation to the system in the primitive Church, thus, "*Our form of catechising, is in accordance with the mode which we have received from the Bishops who have preceded us, and according as we were taught when we laid the foundation of faith and were baptized, and according as we have learned from the Scriptures.*"

The reasons which induced the early Christians to pay such very particular attention to the instruction of children and candidates for church fellowship, are well described by Jamieson, in the following extract:

"While those who were entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper were exclusively denominated the *faithful*, and considered as occupying the rank of perfect, or approved Christians, there were several other classes of persons who though connected with the Church, and forming constituent parts of it, were yet separated from, and inferior to the former, being in various stages of advancement towards a qualification for the holy rites of the gospel. These orders, known as catechumens, were distinguished from each other by lines of demarkation, beyond which none was allowed to pass without a long and gradual preparation; and between a newly made catechumen, and a Christian in the rank of the faithful, there was as wide a difference in the eye of the primitive Church, as between an infant of a day, and one who has attained the stature of a full grown man. In the records of apostolic times, we shall in vain look for any traces of this distinction,*—for then a heathen no sooner made an avowal of his faith in Christ than he received the initiatory right of Christianity. His con-

* That is, we have no evidence that the apostles prosecuted the work of catechization in the *same form*, in which it was subsequently carried forward by the Church.

version was immediately followed by his baptism, and whatever shades of difference there might be in the knowledge of the new converts, all were considered as equally entitled to the outward sign, as they were to the inward spiritual benefit of the ordinance. But in process of time when the Church was enlarged by a daily influx of members from Heathenism, and when her purity was no longer guarded by the presiding care of those who possessed the miraculous gift of discerning spirits, the pious solicitude of her rulers in after-times, gave rise to the custom of deferring the admission of converts into the fellowship of the Church, till clear and satisfactory evidence was obtained of their fitness, in point of knowledge and sincerity, to be enrolled in the ranks of the disciples. The dear-bought experience of the primitive Christians, had convinced them, that the gross habits of idolators were not easily, and all at once, in many instances relinquished for the pure and spiritual principles of the Gospel, and that the multitude of professed believers held their faith by so slender a tie, that the slightest temptation plunged them anew into their former sensuality, and the first alarm drove them back into the enemies' camp. To diminish, and if possible to prevent the occurrence of such melancholy apostacies, which interrupted the peace and prosperity of the Christian society, and brought a stain on the Christian name, was a consummation devoutly wished for by the pious fathers of the primitive age, and accordingly, animated by a spirit of holy jealousy, they adopted the rule, which soon came into universal practice, of instituting a severe and protracted inquiry into the character and views of candidates for admission to the communion of the Church,—of not suddenly advancing them to that honorable degree, but of continuing them for a limited period in a state of probation. It was thus that the order of catechumens arose, an order which though unknown in the age of Peter and Paul, boasts of a very early introduction into the primitive Church; and, at whatever period its date may be fixed, its origin is to be traced to the laudable desire of more fully instructing young converts in the doctrines of the Christian faith; and at the same time, afford-

ing them opportunites to give evidence of the sincerity of their profession, by the change of their lives, and the holiness of their conversation."*

From this extract alone, we may learn in what estimation catechising was held in the primitive Church. Men of the highest rank in the Church appear to have exercised themselves in this work. Origen's close mode of Catechetical Ministry, was blessed to the conversion of many heathen bystanders of influence. Cyril and Augustine, two of the most eminent Church Fathers, gave their strong testimony in favor of this method of promoting intelligent and solid piety. But this primitive, and scriptural system of disseminating divine truth, and promoting the true interests of the Church, was gradually thrust aside, and rendered almost nugatory, as the dark ages of papal tyranny and superstition advanced. No sooner, however, had the light of the glorious Reformation dawned, and cast its first rays upon the Church and the world, than the ancient custom of catechising was again revived.

The blessed Reformers, whom God raised up to restore in his Church purity of doctrine and of worship, were men emphatically of the *Catechism*. And whilst these servants of Christ, spared no pains to enlighten, by their verbal instructions, as well as by their writings, those of mature age, they entered with the utmost vigor and perseverance upon the work of resuscitating the ancient system of catechising. And for this purpose a large number of catechisms, adapted to the different capacities of children and youth, were prepared and extensively circulated. It was earnestly enjoined upon parents, to co-operate with their pastors and teachers in the work of indoctrinating their children in the truths and principles of the blessed gospel. And so potent did these efforts prove, in dissipating the clouds of superstition and error, that the Romanists bitterly complained of the "mischief which the Protestants have done the Catholic Church, not only by their tongues, but especially by their writings called *Catechisms*."†

* *Manners of Prim. Christ.* pp. 130—2.

† *Preface to Catechism*, published by Council of Trent.

And it is indeed hard to see how the Reformation could have been carried forward with any degree of success, *without* the Catechism. It was necessary, that the friends of evangelical truth should enter the very nurseries of the Church, the family and the school, and there, on the soil of young and tender minds, scatter the precious seed of God's word. But not only for children, was this mode of disseminating divine truth necessary; it was likewise necessary for adults, and those of mature age. For so dense was the moral darkness before the Reformation, to such a degree did ignorance of the Holy Scriptures prevail, that in point of knowledge, nearly all might properly be regarded as *children*. Hence it was necessary to instruct them also in the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ." Accordingly catechetical instruction was a very efficient means of promoting evangelical truth among adults, as well as among children and youth.

Having said thus much on the origin and history of catechising, we will proceed in what we have yet to say, to take a more narrow and practical view of our subject.

In prosecuting our subject, we would not insist on any one mode, or plan of catechising, to the *exclusion* of every other. We need be concerned mainly, that the divine seed should be faithfully sown, in whatever way, in order that the fruits of righteousness may be duly realized. In reflecting, however, upon the practical prosecution of the catechetical system, we naturally recur in our minds to the *family*, the *school*, and to the *pastoral lecture*. We will, therefore, consider the entire catechetical process, as comprehended in the three departments just named. And first, the *family*. But before the duties of parents can be properly understood, it is necessary to inquire, in what relation their children stand to the Church. For peculiar relations involve corresponding duties. Children, it is admitted, are included in the atonement of our blessed Redeemer; and are the objects, therefore, of the divine mercy and love. The Church is a divine institution, the depository of the oracles of God, and comprehending in herself such means and ordinances as are necessary for the salvation of man.

Salvation, therefore, is not to be sought *outside* the pale of the Church,—not by passing by, and despising the channels of grace she offers to all those who would draw nigh unto God, that they may be saved. If children then are included in Christ's redemption, then it is evident they need salvation, salvation from original sin, from inherent depravity. It follows, therefore, as a consequence, that children should be admitted by holy baptism, to the covenant and Church of God. Baptized children are, consequently, *in* the Church, and not *outside* of it; they are members of Christ's visible Kingdom, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Accordingly, the relation parents sustain to their baptized children is profoundly solemn, and involves corresponding obligations and duties. Even the *natural* relation of parents to their children, lays the foundation of important duties to them; it requires of them the exercise of "natural affection," a suitable provision for their wants, and their constant watchfulness and care. But much more solemn, are their moral, or spiritual relations to their children. Both they and their offspring stand related to a spiritual economy, that infinitely transcends all mere human and natural relations and connexions. The duties of parents may be contemplated as three-fold,—their duties to the Church as individual members,—to their children in view of their relation to them as members of the Church, and to the Church, as a consequence of such relation to their children.

And, in treating of parental duty, it is proper to observe, that the family is divinely constituted, inasmuch as the marriage relation was instituted by God himself. Parents, accordingly, are divinely appointed and authorized to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Hence the right discharge of parental duty, is accompanied by a divine, super-human force. For parents are God's agents; He directs them to train their offspring for himself, for his kingdom and glory. Accordingly, already in their infancy, parents dedicate their children to God, in the holy ordinance of Christian baptism. Thus they testify publicly, that their children are in the highest sense the property of God, and give,

at the same time, their solemn pledge, that, by their prayers, their instructions and example, they will do all they can in a humble reliance upon divine grace, to rear their children for God and for heaven. It is their duty, therefore, to *catechise* their children. And upon this duty they must enter even before their children may be able to read, before they can peruse and study the catechism for themselves. From a *child*, Timothy knew the Holy Scriptures. Just as the soul of the child unfolds and develops itself, as its capacities for the reception of truth are enlarged, should the precious seed of the divine word be scattered upon the soil of the young and tender heart. The spirit of the child as it develops itself into conscious being, should be pre-occupied by the elements of gospel truth, that thus the seeds of sin lodged in its moral constitution, might be prevented from germinating, and producing the mortal fruits of sin and transgression. Children should be made acquainted with God, his attributes, and will, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. They should be made to understand their relations to God as their Creator, Preserver and Redeemer, and also their relation to his Church, by virtue of their baptism.* The privileges as well as the duties involved in this last relation, should be clearly explained, and seriously impressed upon the minds of children. They should be made to understand "that they are not their own, but belong to their faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who with his precious blood has fully satisfied for all their sins." Such a representation of their relation to the Church, together with the other neces-

* Thus P. Henry, in dealing with his children about their spiritual state, took hold of them very much by the handle of their infant baptism; and frequently inculcated upon them that they were born in God's house, and were sometimes dedicated and given up to him, and therefore were obliged to be his servants. *Life*, p. 68. Compare Ps. cxvi. Thus his son bears his personal testimony to the value of this ordinance. "I cannot but take occasion," said he, "to express my gratitude to God for my infant baptism; not only as it was an early admission into the visible body of Christ; but as it furnished my pious parents with a good argument, (and as I trust through grace a prevailing argument) for an early dedication of my own self to God in my childhood. If God has wrought, any good work upon my soul, I desire with humble thankfulness to acknowledge the moral influence of my infant baptism upon it." *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 118.

sary gospel truths, may be expected, under the divine blessing, to become richly productive of the precious fruits of righteousness.

But in order to prosecute properly, the work of catechising, *Catechisms* are necessary. These, however, have been happily supplied. Catechisms, not only adapted to persons of mature age, but such also as are strictly elementary, and well adapted to children and youth. In our own Church, it is our privilege, in the merciful providence of God, to possess, and to hold, as our only symbol and confession of faith, the purely evangelical *Heidelberg Catechism*. And to render its doctrines easier of comprehension to children, it has, as is generally known, been successfully *simplified*, and in several forms, by one of the ministers of our body. Among others, we might yet mention the excellent Catechisms prepared for children and youth, by Dr. Watts. Parents should, accordingly, avail themselves of the excellent helps, made ready to their hand, in the form of those useful summaries of gospel truth. Instruction should not only be imparted to children at an early age, and in an easy and familiar manner without the catechism, that is before children are able to read, but when able, every parent should require each child to commit to memory an approved Catechism, together with the proof texts, and explain to them its doctrines as far as they may be capable of doing so.* The importance of requiring children to commit to memory the Catechism, cannot well be over-rated. It is important even as an intellectual exercise. Especially is this true in communities where but little attention is paid to education, where the school system exists in its most imperfect state, and where as a consequence, the opportunities of mental culture, or intellectual improvement are of the most inferior order. In such circumstances especially, it is not a matter of slight importance to children, in the way of mental discipline, to com-

* In the biography of the Rev. John Newton, it is stated, that when a child four years old, "he could read well, repeat the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, all Dr. Watts' smaller Catechisms, and his Children's Hymns."

This remarkable instance of mental precocity and training, we do not produce of course as a model for universal imitation.

mit to memory a Catechism, together with a large number of proof-texts. This exercise furnishes for the mind a healthy and pleasant excitement, and frequently serves as an important stimulus in leading the mind forward in the general direction of education.

But this exercise is especially to be recommended, as it renders the mind familiar with the most important of all truths, the precious doctrines of the divine Scriptures. And this familiarity with the *letter* of religious truth, could not be secured in any other way. It is by a continued rehearsal, that the language of the Catechism, or of the Bible, is impressed upon the memory, and when this is done in early youth, it will usually be retained in a great measure, even to old age.*

Parents, in prosecuting the great work of Christian nurture, should take special pains to impress their children with the sacredness of divine things. The Church should always be spoken of with due reverence, as a glorious, and divine institution. The office of the ministry, and all the ordinances of the Church, should be treated with similar reverence and respect. In a word, parents should endeavor to infuse into their children a sound churchly spirit, and an aversion to all insubordination and schism. Especially is this necessary in our own age, so distinguished for blind self-will, disorganization and schism, and every species of the wildest radicalism. If these alarming tendencies are to be checked and eventually overcome, Christian nurture must receive more general attention, the principles of truth, of a sound, churchly orthodoxy, must be more universally, and assiduously instilled into the minds and hearts of children. The foundation of an intelligent religious character must be laid in the family. We will yet observe, that in order to secure, under God, the richest fruits of parental culture, instruction must be accompanied by a liv-

* The writer, about a year since, paid a pastoral visit to one of his members, a woman of *eighty-six years*, and being no more able to read, she observed with much apparent emotion, that in her youth she committed to memory the Heidelberg Catechism, and many Scripture passages, to which she can still revert in memory with great satisfaction and benefit. And then, to our great surprise and gratification, she repeated correctly the first, and several other questions and answers of the Catechism.

ing commentary in the form of parental example, as well as by earnest, believing prayer. Paul speaks to Timothy, not only of his knowledge of the Holy Scriptures when yet a child, but in the same connection refers also to the "unfeigned faith" of his grandmother Lois, and his mother Eunice.

We next notice the work of catechising as designed to be carried forward in the *school*. At an earlier period, since the Reformation, the *parochial school* was regarded as indispensable. In these schools, which sustained to the Church a very close and intimate relation, the Catechism held a very important place. Children were not only instructed in letters, but in religion likewise. School teachers, consequently, sustained to the Church also an intimate relation. Teachers, therefore, were regarded with a peculiar respect, approaching that which was entertained for the ministry itself. In the schools, the Bible was the principal book. After having reached a particular point in the progress of their education, all the scholars were required to read in the Bible as a regular school book. In connection with the Bible, the children also studied their catechisms, and recited them to their teachers, who offered upon their contents, a brief and familiar exposition. Besides, in those parochial schools, the delightful exercises of singing and prayer, were by no means uncommon. But alas! a later period, which, although it brought with it many improvements, has also ruled out much that should have been retained, and the want of which, is sincerely lamented by many of the wisest and best men in our land. And as the absence, in a great degree, of a positive religious element, in our Common Schools, is beginning to be more generally and deeply felt and deplored, there is reason for indulging the hope, that perhaps ere long, a reformation in our common school system, will be happily effected in this respect. It may be hoped that the School will not always stand practically divorced from the Church, to the serious detriment of both Church and State. The influence of a merely secular education, upon the interests of the Church and religion, must, in the very nature of the case, be prejudicial, and equally so upon the vital interests of the State.

The strong pillars which support our glorious civil fabric, are education and religion. Mere intellectual light and power, unaided by the superior force of Bible truth and principles, would prove utterly impotent in perpetuating our free institutions. We will here allow ourselves to quote the testimony of Dr. Chalmers on this subject: "It is not scholarship alone," he says, "but scholarship impregnated with religion, that tells on the great mass of society. We have no faith in the efficacy of mechanic institutes, or even of primary, elementary schools for building up a virtuous and well-conditioned peasantry, so long as they stand dissevered from the lessons of Christian piety. There is a charm ascribed to the scholastic system of Scotland; and the sanguine imagination is, that by importing its machinery into England and Ireland, it will work the same marvellous transformation there on the character of their people, that was experienced amongst ourselves. But it is forgotten that a warm and earnest Christianity was the animating spirit of all our institutions, for generations after they were formed, and that, wanting this, they can no more perform the function of moralizing the people, than skeletons can perform the functions and put forth the faculties of living men. The scholastic is incorporated with the ecclesiastical system of Scotland, and that not for the purpose of intolerance and exclusion, but for the purpose of *sanctifying education, and plying the boyhood of our land with the lessons of the Bible*. The scholarship of mere letters might, to a certain extent, have diffused *intelligence* among the people; but it is mainly to the religious ingredient that the moral greatness of our peasantry is owing."

Since, however, in our country the ecclesiastical element has unfortunately been in a large degree separated from the school system, it is a matter for sincere congratulation that the Sabbath school has come, in a good degree, to take the place of the parochial school. The Sabbath school does not, and could not, if even universally established, serve as a full equivalent, or proper substitute for the parochial school, yet it should be gratefully acknowledged, that it supplies in some good degree a serious defect in our school system.

The Sabbath school, in order properly to accomplish its object, should be entirely awake, and fully conscious of its relation to the Church. The Sabbath school is not to be regarded as an independent association, separate from the Church, or congregation. To a great extent, it forms part of the congregation. It is as such, an agency, which the congregation employs to assist parents in the great work of Christian nurture, of training, and educating their offspring, who are, at the same time, her own children, the children of the Church, formally constituted such in holy baptism, and thus preparing them instrumentally, for her full communion and fellowship. The school should, therefore, keep continually in full view its proper position and calling, and should labor earnestly and prayerfully for the spiritual welfare of those whom God regards as his Lambs, that in due time they may be properly qualified in every respect, to assume covenant engagements and to be fully admitted to the fold of Christ. In this view the school cannot be regarded as substituted in the place of parents and thus exonerating them from their peculiar and solemn duties ; it is simply the particular mode of action employed by the Church with the view of aiding parents in their important work, as well as discharging her own duty to her baptized membership. The school cannot possibly perform the work which God requires at the hands of parents ; that is a work which they only can perform. And whatever important service the school, or any other individual may perform for children, the duties of their parents still remain in their full, original force, and it is not possible for them by any means to rid themselves of those duties and obligations. The parental relation itself, would first have to be dissolved, before the duties necessarily growing out of that relation, could be abolished. It is absurd, therefore, to speak of transferring parental duty in a way that would release parents from those obligations which their very position necessarily involves. The Sabbath school, then, is to be regarded as an auxiliary, and if its work is properly prosecuted, a very important and efficient auxiliary to the domestic economy. And as an institution sustaining to the Church such an

intimate relation, the school deserves the favor and encouragement of all the friends of morality and religion.* Pastors, parents, and Church members generally, should manifest for the school a cordial interest, and should be disposed to do what they can to render it as efficient as possible. And if all schools were conducted upon right principles; if the catechism were more generally introduced in connection with the Bible lesson, and if all the classes were supplied with truly pious and competent teachers, the fruits of Sabbath school instruction would be far more abundant and precious than they have hitherto been.

The last department of catechetical labor which yet remains to be noticed, may be denominated the *pastoral*. To this department of pastoral duty, reference has already been had in this paper, in our remarks on the *history* of catechising. We have seen, that, in the most enlightened and purest periods of the Church, the system of catechisation was carried forward with the greatest vigor and perfection. And thus it will ever be. The position of pastors, therefore, in relation to this system, is one of no ordinary importance and responsibility. "Feed my lambs," is the solemn and authoritative injunction of the "chief shepherd." Pastoral catechising admits of a wide and diversified sphere. The pastor may prosecute this work with much success in the form of *family* catechising. He may appoint a day on which he will meet one or several families, convened together in a neighborhood, and thus an opportunity will be afforded to instruct all present, parents, children, and domestics. This particular form of catechization was formerly prosecuted with much vigor and success by our highly venerated sister, the Presbyterian Church. And it is gratifying to know, that the highest judicatory of this body has felt itself called upon to take suitable action in relation

* "It is to these seminaries that we are to look for a succession of youthful branches, which, having been grafted into the body of Christ's Church at baptism, may here imbibe the sap of holy principles, and be prepared by culture under the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, sought for in prayer, to become 'trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord.'" Bishop of London's Primary Charge, 1830.

to this important subject, with the view of restoring this "ancient landmark," which had been partially removed, to its original and highly important, and churchly position. In view of the pastor's peculiar relation to the *Sabbath school*, he may exert in this institution, a very happy influence in favor of sound, elementary instruction. He may do much in the way of counsel, and in giving proper direction in the entire business of teaching, and in the general management of the school. And there, he will have frequent opportunities of scattering the seeds of divine truth upon the mellow soil of young and tender hearts.

But the most solemn part of pastoral catechising is that which contemplates the preparation of the young for full communion with the Church. This is the last and most important stage of the general process of catechetical training. Having passed from the family to the school, they are now placed under the more special and thorough instruction of the pastor, that, by the divine blessing, they may be duly prepared to pass from the school, through the catechetical class, into the Church, and ultimately from the Church into heaven! This work the pious pastor properly regards as profoundly solemn, and as involving a more than ordinary responsibility. The young persons placed under his care are candidates for full communion with Christ's holy Church. They are looking forward to no distant period when they expect to appear before God's holy altar, and there, in His divine presence, and in the presence of his people, renew in their own persons, their baptismal engagements, profess their faith in Christ, renounce satan and his works, and partake of the second sacrament, instituted by the Redeemer for his sincere followers. In these circumstances, the pastor is made to realize, in a degree peculiarly solemn and affecting, that the most vital interests of precious souls for whom Christ died, are entrusted to his care. He at once realizes, however, that his success with his class, will be conditioned very much by their previous training. If they were properly instructed in the family; if, from their childhood, they were surrounded by a healthy, religious element, even should

they not have enjoyed the advantages of a Sabbath school, the pastor will enter upon his work with the pleasant stimulus of a cheering hope, that the seed he is about casting upon well prepared soil, will, under the genial influences of the divine Spirit, germinate, and in due time produce the precious fruits of righteousness.* In the case of such, however, as are brought up in ignorance and in sin, there is far less hope. In their case, the seeds of sin, lodged in our fallen nature, have already germinated, and in a measure produced even at an early age, the noxious weeds of sin and unrighteousness. These foul weeds are to be removed, and the soil of the heart prepared for the precious seed of divine truth. Such need to be instructed in the simplest elements of the gospel. They may be compared to rough, unhewn blocks, just taken out of the quarry; and, it is hardly to be expected, that the sacred sculptor should be able, by the most skillful use of the gospel chisel, to produce in a few months, a beautiful, symmetrical, and life-like figure. Still, all things are possible with God, and by the effectual influences of his Holy Spirit, accompanying the simple exhibition, and persevering inculcation of divine truth, the darkness of spiritual ignorance will gradually be dissipated, the heart be melted into penitence, and Christ, the hope of glory, be formed in the soul. At all events, there cannot be a more favorable opportunity desired by the faithful pastor for instructing the young in the doctrines of religion, than the catechetical class. Here the ignorant and uninstructed, may be encouraged to commit to memory the Catechism and portions of the sacred Scriptures; and here *all*, whatever may have been their previous opportunities, can be clearly and fully in-

* "My first and greatest success," says Mr. Baxter, "was upon the youth; and so it was that when God had touched the hearts of the young with the love of goodness and delightful obedience to the truth; in various instances their friends, their fathers, and their grandfathers, who had grown old in an ignorant and worldly state, did many of them fall into a liking and loving of piety, induced by their love to their children, who now appeared so much wiser and better, and more dutiful to them." So sensible was Dr. Doddridge of the importance of this work, that he resolved at his entrance into the ministry, "I will often make it my humble prayer that God would teach me to speak to children in such a manner as may make early impressions of religion upon their hearts."

structed in the doctrines and precepts of the blessed Gospel. In this capacity, the pastor can with propriety, be especially free and familiar in imparting instruction. And he possesses every opportunity of being close, direct, and personal, in his instructions. The catechumens on their part will understand and feel, that what is said, is said to them and for them. Hence, the truth spoken and earnestly applied and enforced, will be the more likely to make upon their minds a deep and permanent impression. If, accordingly, pastoral catechising is properly and faithfully conducted, and if connected with earnest, believing prayer, the most happy results may be confidently anticipated. And should such results not always appear immediately, they will, in many instances, be realized at a future period. And the *form* of piety produced, under the faithful prosecution of the catechetical system, is eminently normal, and evangelical. As we have seen, this system is designed to bear upon the human soul, already in early childhood, at the very dawn of moral accountability. The aliment to be imparted, is the "pure milk of the word;" and throughout the entire process, nothing is to be presented and inculcated but the pure, unadulterated doctrines of the blessed Gospel. Such wholesome instruction is to be accompanied by earnest and believing prayer, and a living exemplification of the doctrines taught. This system as now defined, excludes all error, it discards all human devices and appliances in the sphere of religion. It relies solely upon God's truth and grace in Christ Jesus. It stands equally removed from dead formality, and wild, senseless fanaticism. The piety produced by this system is intelligent, deep, and living,—not unnatural, wild, fitful, and periodical. Its internal fruits are humility, love, faith, purity, joy, and peace; and its outward manifestations are, all the fruits of a living faith, a cheerful and constant obedience to all the commandments of God. This system contemplates the renewal of our nature, which is totally depraved, into the image of God. It proposes a living union with Christ, the second Adam; such an ingrafting into Christ, that the renewed believer becomes a member of his mystical body, and ani-

mated by his Spirit and life. A living, active piety, accordingly, is the legitimate product of this system. Its soul is supreme love to God, and equal love to man.

If then the Church of Christ would assume her true and proper position, if she would stand forth in her peerless majesty and glory,—she must “lay fast hold of instruction.” In no other way can she accomplish her mission.

Lebanon, Pa.

F. W. K.

ART. IV.—ZWINGLI AT BERN.

THE selections from the works of the great Swiss Reformer, which appeared in two earlier numbers of the Review, gave our readers some idea of his character as a Commentator. We now propose to furnish a specimen of his power and skill as a *controversialist*. For this purpose portions of the famous Disputation of Bern have been selected. This choice has been determined by the simple fact, that the discussions upon that occasion seem to have been conducted more systematically than most others, and so can more readily and fairly be presented in separate parts, without violating their integrity. And, moreover, the particular themes handled in the debate are more definitely and comprehensively stated, and are likely to have more interest just at this time, than those discussed in the Disputations of Zurich, Marburg, or Baden.

After Zurich none of the Cantons of the Swiss Confederacy, seem to have been more deeply agitated by the Great Awakening of the memorable era of the Reformation, than the Canton of Bern. In vain was the influx of the “pernicious and soul destroying heresies,” as the doctrines of grace were styled by the adherents of Rome, resisted. The breath of heaven, which was disturbing and purifying the waters, was

too potent, and the mountain waves, rising high above the stagnant pools of death in which so many had perished, were too mighty to be withstood. In spite of priestly tears, and archepiscopal deprecations, the waves rolled on, washing and cleansing as they went,—possibly carrying away in their resistless course, some things harmless in themselves, and susceptible of good and pious use, but which could still be yielded without regret, seeing they had become so inseparably intertwined, by cunning Popish spindlers, with what was wrong and ruinous. In the storms and earthquakes which occur in the natural world, our minds are readily reconciled to the devastations and even deaths which track their terrible course, by the consideration of the physical benefits which they secure. Why should we be more reluctant to judge as rationally of the more memorable and effective moral movements which have at times upheaved existing social institutions, and reformed or improved them? The advocates of Popery are ever ready to defend their system against the charge of errors, whose existence *even they* have not the hardihood to deny, by averring, “*errare est humanum*.” Why should the friends of evangelical Protestantism be denied the privilege of the same reply, when defending their system, or rather the mighty world movement which led to the resuscitation of their religious system, against the charge of far less criminal and bloody blunders, than have from time to time been committed and exulted in by Rome?

Whoever might hesitate to answer such queries, the pious and earnest Bernese would not. They felt and said indeed that a storm was approaching. There was a rustling in the tops of the Mulberry trees which they could not misinterpret. And there were other signs and omens too which gave solemn intimation that the storm might be frightfully severe. But they knew a storm was needed. The quietness of spiritual death had reigned too long already. So with faith and courage to sustain their hearts, they were willing to let the storm come on. With God to guide it, it could do no harm. With God to govern it, would it not do much good? Accordingly, the proper authorities, in solemn council assembled, resolve to

afford a fair public opportunity to all concerned and interested, to debate upon the merits of the "new doctrines" preached by the Reformer of Zurich and his first followers, so that those denouncing them might enjoy a full opportunity of exhibiting the ground of opposition, and in like manner those maintaining them show why they preferred them to the then prevailing doctrines of the Romish Church. After due consideration, and the necessary preliminary arrangements, the first Sunday after Circumcision, 1528, was fixed upon as the day for the opening of the Disputation. Notices of the appointment and earnest invitations to attend the meeting were sent out in all directions. The four Bishops of Constance, Basle, Lausanne, and Valois, were respectfully entreated to be present, and to bring their Doctors with them. The Bishops, Priests, and Laity of all the confederated Cantons were also notified, and requested to bring the most learned of both parties along. The Zurichers were especially urged to attend, as being best acquainted with the points at issue, and among the rest Zwingli was by no means to be forgotten. All were assured that their persons should not only be sacredly safe, but comfortably and gratuitously provided for during the continuance of the Discussion. And they were furthermore assured that no attempt should be made to obligate any of the confederates who might come, by the decisions adopted, excepting so far as they voluntarily offered to yield to such obligation. One important condition, however, was to be observed by all the Disputants, viz: that no other authorities would be admitted in defence of a dogma advanced, but only the authority of the sacred Scriptures. The testimony of the Fathers and councils might be cited as collateral or circumstantial testimony, but not as authoritative proof, by either party.

At length the appointed 17th of January, 1528, arrived, the most important in the history of Bern. For several days before, delegates had been pouring in from all directions, and it was evident that the hearts and minds of all were deeply and intensely interested in the great object of the convocation. The Bishops, with many other friends of Rome, had indeed

refused to dignify the Assembly with their presence, partly through fear of the enlightening influence of the discussion, but also partly, no doubt, under the conviction that no good could possibly result from what seemed to them so radical a movement. It is sometimes hard for men to see the broad difference between rabid radicalism, and a sober, prayerful effort at reformation.

Besides the Bishops named, five Cantons refused to participate in the proceedings, viz: Luzerne, Uri, Schweiz, Unterwalden, and Zug. The other Cantons were all represented, and some very fully. And among those present were many eminent for piety and learning, and occupying the most important and influential positions in the Confederacy. The meetings were held in the Barefooted Monk's church. After mutual deliberation it was agreed upon that the following theses should be discussed, and in the order in which they stand:

"I. The Holy Christian Church, whose only head is Christ, is born of the Word of God, and will ever hold fast thereto, refusing to hear the voice of a stranger.

II. The Church of Christ enacts no rules or laws without the authority of the word of God. Wherefore all human ordinances, declared to be the laws of the Church, are no further obligatory, than they are founded and commanded in the word of God.

III. Christ is our only wisdom, righteousness, redemption, and satisfaction for the sin of the world. Hence, to acknowledge any other ground of salvation or satisfaction for sin, is to deny Christ.

IV. That the body and blood of Christ are substantially and corporeally received in the bread of the Holy Supper, cannot be proved by the sacred Scriptures.

V. The Mass now celebrated by the Church, in which Christ is offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, is contrary to the Scripture, blasphemous to the most holy sacrifice, sufferings and death of Christ, and, on account of the abuses to which it leads, an abomination to God.

VI. As Christ alone died for us, so He also is our only Me-

diator and advocate before God the Father, and to be called upon as such by believers. Wherefore we henceforth refuse to address any other as mediators or intercessors, unless we are furnished with demonstrations from the Bible.

VII. That the Scriptures teach of no purgatory after this life. Hence, all services for the dead, as vigils, masses, prayers, offerings, tithes, yearly festivals, burning of candles, &c., &c., are utterly vain.

VIII. The making of pictures and images for adoration is contrary to the Word of God, both of the Old and New Testament. Wherefore they are to be removed from all places in which there may be danger of their being worshipped.

IX. Holy Matrimony is forbidden in the sacred Scriptures to no class; on the contrary that impurity and harlotry may be avoided, it is recommended to all.

X. Whereas a public whoremonger is under solemn condemnation according to the Word of God, it follows that impurity and harlotry is more scandalous in the sacerdotal class than any other.

All to be discussed for the glory of God and His holy Word."

The theses having been read, the convention was formally declared ready to proceed to the Discussion, by Dr. Joachim von Watt, Burgomaster of St. Gall, in the name of the presiding officers, and after a brief and affectionate address by Franz Kolb, Predikant in Bern, exhorting all to maintain good will and order in the course of the discussion, the first article was once more read, and the debate commenced.

"The Holy Christian Church, whose only head is Christ, is born of the Word of God, and will ever hold fast thereto, refusing to hear the voice of a stranger."

Berthold Haller, Preacher in Bern, then stated the reasons why the Disputation commenced with the doctrine concerning the Church. The word "Church" is not generally understood by the people; this ignorance is abused, inasmuch as the word is sometimes used in reference to the Church universal, and then again of a representative Church, and in this second sense is transferred to the Hierarchy alone. In this way much

error and false worship has been introduced in the name of the Church, and advantage has been taken of the misapprehension thus existing, to impose spiritual tyranny upon the souls and consciences of men, and to set up the authority of this representative hierarchical Church against that of the word of God. The Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, means in German an *assembly*. And "Church," in the Bible means an assemblage of good and bad, many or few. This "Church," Christ compares to a *field* on which grow wheat and tares until the time of harvest; or to a *net*, in which good and bad fish are caught. The Scriptures also use the word "Church" for the general assembly of all those who believe in Christ, and are predestined unto life, which Church Christ promises to build and found upon the Rock, which is Himself, Math. 16: 18. It is further called the Body of Christ, Eph. 4: 12, etc., and in our old Creed, the Communion of Saints, by which all sincere Christians believe the Church is meant. It has in common those things designated by Paul, Eph. 4: 4-6, "One body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all." As many, therefore, in all the world, as have communion herein, constitute one Church of God. The head of this Church is Christ, Eph. 5: 23, etc. He is her Leader, governs and protects her, and possesses all blessings common to her. Her life and strength proceed from Him alone, with whom she is incorporated, as the branch with the vine. No mere man, therefore, can ever be head of the Church, dispense the gift of God to our heart, or be Saviour of the body.

This Church now is "born of the Word of God," the internal word, the word of faith, which God makes lively and active in us, declaring it in our hearts, (Rom. 10: 8., Peter 1: 22, 23,) which is none other than that publicly proclaimed and contained in the Holy Scriptures. And as the Church is enlightened, renewed, and regenerated by the word of God, so it continues therein, and will not listen to the voice of a stranger, John 10: 5. Hence, according to Scripture, the Church is not a congregation of Cardinals, Bishops, &c., but of those who trust and believe in God through Christ; and neither the

Pope, nor any other man may be the head of the Church, save Christ alone.

But if any one will show us otherwise, from the word of God, we are ready to hear him. Or if any are not willing to recognize this assembly, we are also ready to answer his objections.

Haller having resumed his seat, all were invited, without reserve, to speak in defence of this thesis, or in opposition to it, according to their individual convictions and belief.

Oecolampadius then arose, and commenced with a refutation of the objection that they (the Evangelical party) were apostates from the Holy Christian Communion of Saints. We regard this, he said, as the most horrible crime which could be charged upon a Christian. Every Christian is bound so to live as he may hope to be able to answer for it before God, and to regard the judgment of God far more than that of man. He must, therefore, see carefully to it, that he stand within the limits of the true Church elect of Christ, and not only within the general mixed Church on earth. They are not to be considered apostates from the congregation of the faithful, who labor to persevere in the faith of Christ, and for Christ's sake, to exercise themselves in love towards all men. Such cannot but be fellow-members of the household of faith. But by faith I do not here mean the knowledge of all the particular items of Scripture doctrine, but confidence in God, and in Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, by which faith we are made willing to hear the word of God, and that with such ardent longing, that one would rather forsake the whole world than abandon this faith in Christ.

To this *Alexius Grat*, Preacher and Confessor in the vicinity of Bern, rejoined. If the proposition, "Christ is the only Head of the holy universal Church," is to be understood of the internal influence of grace, and a gracious life, it admits of no dispute. It is to be observed, however, that in that small word "*only*," which is not found in the Bible, something unfair may lie concealed. The head, however, does not only communicate life to the body, but also governs the external movements of the members. And Christ, when he left the

earth, appointed Peter as his representative to govern the Church on earth, and that Peter's authority in this capacity, extends even to heaven. Math. 16: 18, 19. Wherefore also, Christ calls him Cephas, that is head, from the Greek word *κεφαλῆ*.

Haller. If the word "only," is not expressly stated in Scripture, it is still substantially there. For when it is said, "Christ is the Saviour of the body," (Eph. 5: 23,) assuredly neither Peter nor the Pope, can be our Saviour. He also alone governs the members, who without Him can do nothing, (John 15: 5.) The vicegerent whom Jesus left behind Him on earth, is none other than the Holy Ghost, who leads us into all truth and holiness, John 16: 7, etc. But whither does the Pope lead men, who grants his soldiers indulgence to shed blood? Peter is neither the foundation nor corner-stone, but the stone which is laid upon the corner-stone. Peter is called a stone, a rock, because he acknowledged the true Rock; for the name Cephas means *rock*, and is a Syrian word, (in which tongue Christ spake,) and not derived from the Greek.

Bucer remarked further: It does not follow, that because a man instructs and directs, he is therefore *head*, any more than that every one is king who may possess some of the qualifications of a king; *e. g.*, as to have a knowledge of the constitution and laws. Only he is king who is invested with full authority to govern. Paul calls Christ the Head of the Church because He gives her life and salvation by his Spirit. None else has power to do this; even the Apostles, of themselves, could do no more than impart outward instruction, which, of itself, is powerless, if Christ does not make it exert a living and saving power in the heart; for God only giveth the increase. The Scriptures call the office of the apostles a stewardship, and thus make Peter a servant and not the Head. 1 Cor. 4: 1.

Alexius Grat was about to reply to this, by quoting Chrysostom's allegorical exposition of Luke 5: 4, 5, but was requested to confine himself to Scripture proofs. Then he defended Peter's authority by quoting Luke 22: 32: "Strengthen thy brethren;" Math. 16: 18, 19: "Rock and key;" John 21:

15, etc.: "Feed my Lambs." By these, he and his successors, as viceregents of Christ, are empowered to bind and to loose, to direct and teach, to command and forbid. Even inferiors are sometimes denominated Heads in the Bible, and Math. 16: 19, constitutes Peter Head of the Church.

Bucer. Yes, if you can show that Peter or other Apostles, had power to change and sanctify the heart of man.

Grat. I stated at the outset, that I was speaking of the external government of the Church. And now Bucer brings forward the internal. I conceded before that Christ is the only Head of the Church. But He has invested a vicegerent with so much power, that his authority has not reference simply to the external government of the Church, but also reaches over to its internal affairs, if these become known to him through confession or open acknowledgment; for it is manifest that to forgive or not forgive sins, concerns the conscience or soul alone. By this, however, I will not pretend to justify abuses that may have crept in.

Thus ended the Disputation for the first day.

The next morning, *Haller* opened the discussion, by confirming the assertion, that the Apostles are not Heads, but servants of the Church, with the citation of 1 Cor. 3: 5; 1 Peter 5: 2. If the *authority*, he said, conferred upon Peter made him Head of the Church, then all the Apostles were Heads; for all possessed similar authority and office, especially Paul, who labored more than they all. If *teaching* constitutes him Head, then every Apostle, as well as Peter, would be Head wherever he taught. And as neither the Pope, nor any other man, can teach a whole land, much less the entire world, it follows that none can be Head. If Peter taught in Rome, and was pastor and minister there, but wrote an epistle for our instruction, then would he also minister for us. All the passages cited by Grat, ascribe to Peter nothing but authority to minister unto or serve the Church. In John 1: 43, Cephas, or Peter, signifies rock, one built and established upon faith and the Word, and forming with other living stones, a building raised up upon Christ. 1 Peter 2: 5, Math. 17: 24,

show that Christ has subordinated Himself and the Church to the temporal and civil authorities, in all outward things, relating to earthly goods and possessions. If Luke 5: 4, is to be allegorically interpreted, it means as much as: Be diligent in your calling! Luke 22: 32, alludes to a service to be rendered. And so too, John 21: 15, "Feed my sheep." For if feeding the sheep constituted a man Head of the Church, we would all be Heads, who teach from the word of God. In Math. 16: 19, to bind and loose, to forgive and retain sins is one thing, and this authority is conferred equally upon all Apostles, according to John 20: 23, and means nothing more than to proclaim the conditions of salvation according to the word of God. God alone truly forgives sins, and by His own authority, Isaiah 43: 25. But the Apostles forgive sins by preaching the Gospel, that unto those who believe, forgiveness is granted for the sake of Christ, but that the sins of unbelievers remain unpardoned, as in Jer. 1: 9, 10, where God, in a certain sense, ascribes to the prophet what He himself does. And the peculiar circumstances of the texts quoted, show that this is meant in each of them.

Grat. A King is also a servant, and a Grand-duke is a subject in reference to the King. But in reference to those placed under their authority, they are superiors and rulers.

Haller. We ask for proof that Peter was such a superior.

Grat. Peter exhibited, in a most remarkable manner, the power of healing which Christ conferred on the disciples, performing a cure even by his shadow, Acts 5: 15. He proposed the filling of the vacancy in the apostolical college, Acts 1: 15, etc.; he was the first to give his opinion in the council at Jerusalem, Acts. 15: 6, etc.; he inflicted the punishment upon Ananias and Sapphira, Act 5: 1; he was the first to preach on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2: 14; and thus, as is foretold in Psalm 45: 17, he was appointed to be Prince over all the earth as well as over the Apostles.

Bucer. To teach the Church, (and no Apostle could do more than this,) is to be the Church's minister and servant, not her Head. Grat should produce Scripture to show that Peter is called Head.

Grat. in reply, demanded Scripture for the word "*only*," which is not synonymous with "*one*." I have shown that Peter, by Christ's command, exercised superior authority in the Church.

Bucer. Since no one but Christ possesses that power, which belongs to a Head of the Church, it follows that He must be the only Head. And since no one can intercede between God and man, but Christ alone, it follows that in 1 Tim. 2: 5, "*one*" is equivalent to "*only*," as in the Articles, "I believe in one God," &c.

Grat. I am not speaking now of *one Mediator*, but of *one Head*. None of those passages which speak of the ministrations of Peter, destroy the authority over the flock with which Christ invested him. It is said of Christ also, Rom. 15: 8, "Christ was a minister of the circumcision." Your interpretations I do not receive. No Scripture has been cited to invalidate the power or office of the Pope.

Bucer. The experience of faith unites with all Scripture in testifying that Christ alone can give the Holy Ghost, and that therefore He alone is qualified rightly to teach and govern his Church; wherefore He alone must be acknowledged Head of the Church. It is not enough for Grat to reject our interpretations; he should show reason for so doing from the word of God. The notion of a human co-head, and vicegerent is a dangerous human invention, by which God and Jesus Christ are shamefully blasphemed.

At this point *Huter*, of Appenzell, came to the aid of Grat, and said: I grant that Christ is the only Head of the Church. But he has appointed a temporal power to bind and loose; for to do this requires authority; and He made Peter a principal vicegerent for the execution of this authority of His word and commandment.

Haller. If Christ is the only Head, there is no need of a vicegerent; for to Him all power is given in heaven and on earth. The mere declaration of a man, "I release you from your sins," is not enough, unless I am assured in my heart by true faith, that he has power to say so. It is "God who

openeth and shutteth," Is. 22: 22. And to proclaim this is the Apostles' office.

Huter. No Apostles, Popes, or Priests, ever were empowered to absolve any one from sin who had not faith. But in confirmation of their authority, and its extent, I may cite, 1 Tim. 1: 20. There Paul exercised authority to give Hymeneus and Alexander over to the power of the devil, that they might learn to blaspheme God no more.

Haller. The Apostles did not grant forgiveness on their own authority. Christ commands every Church to exclude stubborn sinners, Math. 18: 17.; 1 Cor. 5: 3-5.

Huter expressed great joy, that *Haller* conceded to the Church the power of excommunication; for until now, it was supposed that it was against the exercise of this authority, that the Reformers chiefly complained. But this power necessarily required those who could exercise it, and to guard against a misinterpretation of Scripture, requires divine authority to interpret it.

Haller. But this is not to be done in an arbitrary way. And now I demand Scripture to show that there is another Head of the Church, besides Christ, invested with power to govern her on earth. In Math. 18: 17, the power of the ban is conferred upon the Church; but not upon the universal Church, which can never be assembled; nor the Church as a convocation of the Pope and the Bishops, nor to one Prelate or Bishop alone, but upon each particular Church which receives the word of God, and within which the offender may be found. Thus the Church in Rome is commanded to excommunicate the Pope, if he becomes an open transgressor; so also that in Bern, Appenzell, and all others. This power is conferred by Christ for the punishment of public offences and sins, and not to afford a covering for the levying of taxes, collection of monies, &c. But now it is plain as open day, that most of those who have hitherto dealt in excommunication, have permitted the grossest transgressors, such as drunkards, gamblers, whoremongers, murderers, to continue undisturbed in their iniquities; and have only used their power in a way to bring reproach upon religion, to protect themselves in their iniquity and tyranny.

Here *Zwingli* took hold of the argument: "Faithful, beloved friends and brethren in Jesus Christ! Inasmuch as the Pastor from Appenzell has referred to the power of excommunication, allow me very briefly to say something upon this point. And, first of all, it is necessary, as in all things that are doubtful appeal must be taken to the law and the testimony, that we turn in this case also to the law of excommunication laid down by our Lord. This we find in Math. 18: 15-17. From this passage we learn, first, that it is not allowed for *one* person to excommunicate, but only privately to admonish; consequently, Popes and Bishops have abused their office by administering admonitions publicly before the whole congregation, seeing this is to be done in a private and friendly manner. In the next place, we learn here, that two or three are not allowed to excommunicate an offender, but simply to exhort, and be ready to testify in the case, should it prove necessary. Then he is to be admonished by the Church, so gracious and merciful is God. And should the offender continue obstinate, and persist in his sin, then first is he to be regarded as an heathen man and a publican. From all which, it is evident, that no one is permitted to excommunicate but the Church council, or congregation, together with the pastor or bishop. And in view of this, we cannot think otherwise, than that Paul pursued this course in the cases referred to; as we may also see in 1 Cor. 5: 3-5, where he tells us that he did not excommunicate in his individual capacity, but in connection with the Church. And allow me, most worthy Sir, Pastor from Appenzell, to point out to you here, why the Apostle Paul calls the ban the destruction of the flesh. He calls flesh what we commonly call *external*, as Heb. 10: 13, where he speaks of "the purifying of the flesh," meaning an external act or cleansing. Take an example. According to the law of Moses, every mother, after the birth of a child, was required to offer two turtle-doves, or young pigeons, for her purification; but this offering did not render her inwardly righteous; for the offering was of itself a mere external ceremony, appointed for her re-admission to the congregation. By fleshly purifications,

therefore, Paul means external purifications. And so in this passage, by "giving him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," he means external destruction. For the ban is nothing else than a casting out and exclusion of a bad member, who was previously already rejected by God, and consumed by sin. Wherefore the Pastor from Appenzell did not fairly reject the assertion of our beloved brother, Oecolampadius, in which he stated, according to the prophet Hosea 13: 9. "Thou hast destroyed thyself, O Israel." For just as the priests in the Old Testament did not make a man leprous, but simply examined and detected the leprosy in him, who was previously leprous, so also may the Church exclude none but such as prove by their grossly and openly wicked lives, that they are not the friends of God. But until the exclusion of such, they continue to be regarded as members of the Church, in common with the most devout; but before God they are not righteous, unless they have true repentance and faith in their hearts, which cannot co-exist with a boldly sinful life; although the person excommunicated in Corinth, appears to have amended his ways and repented soon after his excommunication. And this proves that the grace of God, which permitted him to fall, also raised him up again; whence it appears, that he was again received of God before he was restored to the Church. It follows, therefore, that they are to be excluded who have fallen away from God, and they again received who have been previously pardoned by God. On this account, therefore, Paul calls exclusion from the whole congregation, an external destruction, because that one who formerly stood in regular connection with the Church, becomes exposed as a disobedient and rejected member of the fold of God. The ban, therefore, is an exposure of the offender by whom reproach has been brought upon the Church, so that the Church may be vindicated and the offender chastised. But it is a great mistake in the worthy Pastor from Appenzell, continually to insist, that the ban is a power conferred on man by God, hoping thereby, as I perceive, to be able to introduce an earthly Head in which this power must centre. For the power of banning be-

longs to Christ alone, as Paul plainly shows when he says, "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." All, therefore, who would exercise this authority, must do so according to the Spirit of Christ, otherwise they exercise it violently and wantonly. Let him suppose, that a Church council is altogether composed of ungodly men, who refuse to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it should say to the congregation under their care, you worship idols, and are idolaters, (even if it were not so,) they would then excommunicate those holding to truth and righteousness, upon the false charge of their being in error and sin. It follows, hence, that the power to ban does not so belong to man, as has been contended. For where God does not authorize it to be exercised by His word and Spirit, there it is a tyranny and an abuse, and not a discipline beneficially applied. And when my friend attempted afterward also to bring in the words of Paul, 1 Tim. 1 : 20, "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme,"—hoping thereby to show that Paul exercised the power of banning on his own authority, he also erred through an oversight of the usage of Scripture, in which the figure *synecdoche* frequently occurs,—a form of speech in which either the parts are put for the whole, or the whole for its parts. As if we should call the delegates from Bern, the Bernese; or should say, they from Bern replied, when but one spoke in the name of the rest. Thus Paul speaks here, meaning not that he did it of himself, but that, on account of their apostacy, which he brought to the notice of the Church, they had been excommunicated. Thus much I desired to say, with reference to this point, dear brethren, that Pastor Huter and others, might see that the thesis now before you, is sustained and not condemned by 1 Tim. 1 20.

Here several rose and said, that the Disputation did not seem to be conducted in a truly impartial manner, inasmuch as one party enjoyed better opportunity of defending their views than the other. When they assembled, therefore, again the next morning, after opening the meeting as usual with

prayer, the President, in the name of his associates, invited those who desired to oppose the theses, to come forward and sit together on one side of the platform, so that they might freely consult together and make such arrangements as they wished for replying to the arguments offered in their defence. Hereupon *Dr. Konrad Treger*, Provincial of Freyburg, whom the clergy of Strasburg had requested to attend the Disputation, came forward and took a seat. When the meeting was then brought to order, *Dr. Treger* arose and said: That he had not been commissioned to attend this public Disputation by the authorities of Freyburg, or by the Bishop of Lausanne; but that as he had been specially invited, he had come of his own accord, out of respect to these worthy gentlemen of Bern, and this Disputation, to contend against the ten articles. But he wished to be understood in all that he said, as desiring to be in subordination to the proper authorities of the Church, and a general Council, and willing to be instructed thereby. The first two articles, he then added, are, according to the letter at least, not contrary to the doctrine of the Christian Church; though everything depends upon the sense in which they are used. For explanation sake, I will state two in contrast with them: "The Holy Christian Church, which is eternally preserved and governed by the Spirit of her Bridegroom, as she will not hear the voice of a stranger, so also is he a stranger to her and her Bridegroom, Jesus Christ, who will not hear her voice. Wherefore, secondly, she excludes from the Christian fold, all who violate the Christian unity, and all heretics, inasmuch as the highest authority to execute ecclesiastical functions, is found with her as the pillar and ground of the truth." Those two articles deny this, and demand that the word of God shall be the only judge in matters of faith, and life. This I contradict. If a controversy arises in the Church upon matters of faith, it is necessary to have a judge, who shall decide which is the shepherd and which the wolf. The Church is this judge, according to Math. 18: 17.

Dr. Wolfgang Fabricius Capito, Predicant in Strasburg, rejoined upon this: It is evident that *Dr. Treger* has used the

word "*Church*" in a double sense, and then assumed that the external Church was judge. The Holy Christian Church is the spiritual assembly of all the faithful, as members of one body, which is begotten and governed only by her Head, Jesus Christ. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet is judged by no man," 1 Cor. 2: 15. Inasmuch, therefore, as the Bible is certainly given by the Spirit of God, no better external means for suppressing error can be found than the Scriptures, seeing the Spirit will not oppose itself. The Bible tells us what are the fruits of the Spirit, and thereby the Church detects the wolves, which are excluded then not upon her own authority, but upon that of Christ.

Treger. If the spiritual man may judge all things, then assuredly, he may also judge the Scriptures. And yet some of you have thought that the Bible would allow of no judge. When Christ saith: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a publican," he spake of no heavenly and invisible Church; for such a Church cannot act or decide or ban in matters of faith. In Math. 18: 19, the Lord gives us an external visible Judge in doctrinal controversies, not one that is invisible and undiscoverable.

Capito. Certainly the spiritual man judgeth all things subject to judgment. But the Bible, which is from God, is not thus subject to human judgment. The Church, which possesses authority to excommunicate, is every particular assembly of the faithful; it is indeed an external assembly, but one which judges by the Holy Ghost alone, and whose judgment extends only to offenders. In matters of faith, the office of the Church is not to decide what is truth and error, but to show simply what the Bible declares to be such, all according to the fair analogy of faith.

Treger. To judge, is not to reject the Scriptures, which is given to us by the Church, as revealed by the Spirit of God, and therefore holy; but to ascertain the spirit and sense thereof, and in how far they are written by the Spirit of God. Our opponents cannot deny this right to the Church, inasmuch as some of them arrogate to themselves this right, extolling some

of the books of the Bible as being full of the spirit and truth of the Gospel, (as *e. g.*, the Epistle to the Romans, the Gospel of John, &c., &c.) and disparaging others, (as the Epistle of James, the Apocalypse, &c.,) though the Church has regarded them as sacred and divine for more than a thousand years. Why then should not the whole catholic holy Christian Church not have the power and right, to judge of the spirit of the Scriptures, and decide by whom they were written? John says: "Prove the spirits, whether they be of God," &c. Therefore, the Scriptures may be judged. If, furthermore, we should concede, (which, however, is not the case,) that Math. 18: 19, speaks only of offenders, and is not to be understood of matters of faith, then I would ask, where will you find a greater offender than he who causes dissension and schism in the Church, contends against the true sense of the word of God, and raises new sects and parties? It is doubtless to such an offence as this our Lord alludes, when he says: "If a member offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee." And here no single congregation is meant, which may err, and is, therefore, incapable of judging in spiritual matters; we must have an infallible judge.

Bucer replied to this at considerable length, insisting upon it, that no one was allowed to receive or reject Scripture at pleasure, or to be a judge of the Bible in this sense; that whilst it was the privilege and duty of all to examine and ascertain what the Bible taught, their right did not extend beyond this. And this was the privilege of each Christian, not the exclusive prerogative of a council. For as each one must live by his own faith, so each one must examine and be convinced for himself. He acknowledged that they who caused distractions and schisms were indeed guilty of a great sin. But we must be careful to ascertain who really do this, lest we blame the innocent with the sin of the guilty. He reminded them how frequently Councils contradicted and condemned each other, and of the bitter contentions between various parties in the Romish Church, some of which stood in deadly hostility to each other, as *e. g.*, the regular clergy and the Barefooted Monks. And

as to infallibility; he denied that it was to be found among men, as that prayer of our Lord implies: "Forgive us our trespasses," a prayer which the whole Church needed daily to offer. But where there is sin, there is error. To all this Treger made a long and vigorous response, admitting, indeed, that neither the Church nor any Church council, possessed authority to reject a portion of Scripture belonging to the canon. But he insisted that the opinion advocated by his opponent, must and did lead to hopeless confusion, as was most sadly proved by the diversities and dissensions existing between the various parties connected with the new movement. Although scarcely ten years had passed since the agitation had commenced, all present knew how angrily the parties were arrayed against each other. There were Lutherans, Zwinglians, Carlstadtians, Oecolampadians, Anabaptists, and he knew not how many others, with equally singular names. Luther condemned Zwingli, declaring that his view was the only true one. And so again Zwingli condemned Luther, and so of the rest. Who could tell which was right, or where these dissensions would end. For all this there was no remedy but in the old doctrine of the established Church; he therefore exhorted the good Bernese to adhere to that.

Thus another day had passed. The next morning was mainly occupied by Bucer, in a full and able reply to the speech of Treger, made the day before. He acknowledged the existence of far more disagreement than should be found. But this was not to be laid to the charge of the truth, or of the principle for which they contended. Moreover, the point to be settled was not, whether carrying out the doctrine of Scripture upon this subject led to distraction for the time, but whether the Bible gave authority to the earthly Church, arbitrarily to settle such disputes. Their opponents must not evade this point by bringing in things which have no bearing, as proof, upon it. There were divisions and distractions in the early Church, in the days of the Apostles, which were met not by violent outward force, but by the Scriptures and Spirit of Christ alone. And Bucer again, in conclusion, admonished the good Christians of Bern,

not to follow the dictates of any arrogant vicegerent, or fallible council, but the footsteps of Him who said, "Come unto me all ye that are heavy-laden, I will give you rest."*

After these remarks by Bucer, *Zwingli* again arose to reply to the allusion made to him by Dr. Treger: "Inasmuch as my respected fellow-citizens of Zurich, that venerable ancient town, which has always, both in peace and war, conducted its affairs so discreetly and honorably, have been charged with having suffered themselves to be misled by me; it may be expected, however gratuitous the charge may be, that I will not suffer it to pass unanswered. I therefore utterly repel that reproach. They were not misled by me, neither was it my doctrine they believed. It was not until, like the more noble Berean Israelites, (Acts 17: 11) they compared the doctrines I preached, which are not mine, but God's, with the word of God, and found them to be in full harmony therewith, that they embraced, not my teachings, but those found thus in the Divine Word, and resolved firmly to adhere thereto, and to reform and organize the Church in their city according to those doctrines, irrespective of all opposing human inventions. As to the personal charge preferred against myself, that I boast of my knowledge of the sense and spirit of the Holy Scriptures, it is unworthy of reply, as it is most unjust; in proof whereof I would merely refer to my published writings, and to those who have ever heard me preach. I must, therefore, beg the worthy Provincial, henceforth, to abstain from such calumnious and false statements, and confine himself more closely to the word of God, for the vindication of his opinions, so that our time be not unnecessarily squandered. As for the rest, full account will be given of the views of Oecolampadius as well as my own, in the course of this Disputation, should it be continued by the will of God.

Treger rejoined. Martin Bucer employed the greater part of this day with the delivery of a long sermon, and the intro-

* On account of the great length of these speeches of Treger and Bucer, they have been given in a condensed form, so as to allow more room for presenting the remarks of Zwingli in full, as reported.—Translator.

duction of a large amount of curious matter into his discourse. Here he was interrupted by the President, supposing that he was about to go into a lengthy speech about the doings of the meeting in Strasburg, which they said had nothing to do with the present Disputation. They, therefore, asked him to remember the rules adopted for the government of the Discussion, and urged him to shun all abusive language and personalities, and adhere to Bible proofs. The difficulty between him and the Strasburg ministers might be settled between themselves at some more suitable time. On the other hand, he was at full liberty to oppose the Articles under debate, with all the Scripture arguments he could adduce, and thus contend with Scriptural weapons against those who maintained them. Against this *Treger* protested. If he was not allowed the unrestricted privilege of saying whatever he thought appropriate in the case, he would not take any part in the debate, seeing such privilege was granted to Bucer during the former part of the day. The proceedings of the Disputation would probably be published, and if he were not permitted to reply as circumstances might require, it might be thought that he was unable to do so, if a law existed "bridling his tongue." The President then guaranteed him all proper liberty, only that he must abstain from personalities. Others also assured him that the President no way intended to interfere with his liberty freely to argue the subject under consideration. Nicolas Briefer especially reproved both parties for having introduced things into their discourses which did not belong to the discussion, and said this would not be allowed in future. Capito and Bucer apologized by saying, that as *Treger* had commenced those personal attacks, they were compelled to reply, though they endeavored to do it with Scripture, and pledged themselves to do this still more carefully in what they might yet say. They reminded further, that they had requested for *Treger* the privilege of answering this time in his own way, so that he might have no excuse, but that it was refused as being contrary to the rules of order adopted.

Hereupon *Zwingli* entered a counter-protest to that of Tre-

ger, stating that he misrepresented the case by declaring that privilege of speaking, and particularly of answering him, had been denied him, (Treger,) whereas nothing was refused but indulgence in slanderous remarks, &c. After this, Treger did not again appear at the Disputation.

Huter then took notice of what Haller had said in reference to the ban. In Acts 20: 28, and Eph. 4: 11, it is sufficiently plain who are authorized to govern the Church. Paul does not say that every one is allowed to govern according to his own mind. This in brief: our opponents may also abstain from their prolix and tedious speeches.

Haller. But what does the word *Bishop* signify? Watchman, pastor, not Lord; one whose ministry is to teach, (Eph. 4: 12,) not to be *head*. Otherwise there would be as many Heads as Bishops, and several even in one Church, (Eph. 4: 11.)

Huter. A man may at once be a Pastor or Teacher, and the head or ruler of those whom he teaches. Christ calls Himself the light of the world. But the Apostles were also lights. They were likewise shepherds, and yet Christ calls Himself the only Shepherd.

Haller. The passages in 1 Cor. 12: 4-6, and 1 Peter 5: 2, 3, show that all the offices appointed in the Church were for ministration, and not lordships. If, in any case, they direct how things are to be done, it is not by virtue of any authority lodged in them, but according to the word of God, they declare what God enjoins, God speaking in and through them by His word. Christ is the light of the world essentially. The Apostles only by reflection, *per participationem*.

Huter. Then the Apostles may also be heads or rulers *per participationem*.

Haller. There are many offices and office-bearers. But these are all *members* of the body of Christ, but not the *head*, by which life is communicated to the members, and the body saved. The Apostles were lights who received their light from Christ, as do all believers; but it does not thence follow that all are heads of the Church.

Zwingli. I desire, briefly, to explain in what sense Christ

is the light, and in what sense the Apostles. Christ is the true essential light, (John 1 : 9,) and all the light which the Apostles possessed, He gave to them. Take an example : The sun sheds light in upon us through the windows and makes it day ; the day or light, however, are nothing of themselves, for as soon as the sun ceases to shine it becomes dark. So too the Apostles have only so much light as Christ, the sun of Righteousness imparts to them, and where this sun does not shine there is no light. Christ alone, therefore, is the light, the life, the power, which illumines and revives and sustains all men. The Apostles, therefore, are enlightened members of the Church, and such as have been made alive by the power of Christ, and not heads, as you will permit me to say, worthy Sir Pastor, for your benefit and that of others who may not know it.

Huter. When Mr. Berthold stated that the twelve Apostles were not of themselves essential lights of the world, there was no need of argument ; for none denied it. But when he added that Christ was the only essential light, and the Apostles not in any sense, we cannot admit it. As for Mr. Ulrich Zwingli's example, about the light shining in upon us through the window, I am ready to acknowledge, without such illustrations, what is true light and the source of all light. Only I hope he will allow some of those rays beaming through the windows to shed light upon me too. I wish to be understood as confessing that Jesus Christ, my Lord, my preserver and the preserver of all the world, is a Head of the Church. But no one can prove to me that He has not left behind Him an appointed temporal head, to govern the Church, as I have shown by those passages adduced from the Holy Scriptures. as every Christian reader of the Scriptures can see for himself.

Zwingli. I did not introduce my comparison for the purpose of founding thereon the Divine word, but to enable all thereby the better to apprehend the sense of Scripture, in imitation of the manner of Paul, (Rom. 1 : 19.) It seems, then, that Pastor Huter acknowledges that Jesus Christ, his Lord, his own and the world's preserver, as a head over the Church.

These are his own words, as you all have understood them. Wherefore I praise God, who hath promised that if any call upon Him He will hear, that He hath this day heard the pious Christians of Bern, who have been so earnestly entreating Him in these days, to illumine the hearts of the benighted,—inasmuch as the worthy Pastor, our brother from Appenzel confesses that Christ the Lord is his preserver, and preserver of the whole world. For in so far as he may have declared this in true hearty faith, he will henceforth desire no other Head, no other Helper, no other Light, no other Father or Comforter. For whoever has once drunk from this fountain, will never thirst (John 4: 13) after any other salvation; will never desire other light or other consolation. From which I readily perceive, that he considers all the comforts which creatures afford as worthless. For this concession, in a word, I praise and thank the Lord.

Here the discussion closed for the day.

January 11. The Disputation was resumed by

Huter. In thy name, Lord Jesus Christ! AMEN. Worthy fellow-Christians! When I asked Master Ulrich Zwingli to explain his illustration and example of the window and the two lights, he answered: that he had not introduced it as an argument drawn from Scripture, and forthwith followed with a great cry and hurrah! as though I had fallen in with his opinion. I think, however, that no such concession will appear on the official record of this assembly. In acknowledging God as my Saviour, and the Saviour of the whole world, as all sincere Christians should do, I only did what I had done long before I knew Master Ulrich Zwingli; but I contend, nevertheless, that a spiritual power and authority have also been established on earth, as I clearly proved from the Holy Scriptures, as may be seen by turning to the Clerk's record. And I now protest before this entire honorable assembly, that I do not hold to Master Ulrich's faith or doctrine, and never will, but that I adhere to the unity of the Christian Church of ancient date, and if necessity requires, will die for it.

Zwingli. Worthy fellow-Christians! As to what Pastor

Huter says of his not being of my faith, although he yesterday affirmed that he acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ as his Preserver and the Ruler of the world, I beg leave to say, that this is my faith, and would merely refer every one of you to his language as found on the record of yesterday, in order to see how far his declaration now made, corresponds with what he then said.

Nicolas Christen, of Zofingen, now rose and said, That it seemed very painful to him to dispute about doctrines which holy and learned men had fully settled 1200 years ago. For his part he would do no more than give account of his faith. He desired, however, in advance to recall anything he might inadvertently utter, which might conflict with the universal Christian Faith or the proper sense of the holy word of God. The authority and power of the Apostle Peter, and that he was constituted the Head of the Church, is shown by Math. 16: 19, where it is affirmed that Christ gave the keys to Peter alone. It is true Christ gave power to bind and loose to all the Apostles, but to Peter in the highest sense.

Haller. Peter spoke in the name of all the rest, and received the power of the keys in the name of all.

Christen. Why then did not Christ say: I give unto *you* the keys?

Haller. This is explained by John 20: 22, 23: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c. In many passages we find a part used for the whole, and so the reverse. What the Lord said to Peter and Andrew, "I will make you fishers of men," also applied to all the Apostles.

Christen. Math. 16: 19, and John 20: 23, are not similar. It does not follow, therefore, that what Christ said in the one he meant in the other also.

Haller. And yet these two passages do correspond. In Math. 16: 19, it is not said: *Tibi soli dabo*; but to "Feed my sheep," is enjoined upon all ministers of the word of God.

Zwingli. I desire, dear brethren, to offer a few remarks, in explanation of the words of John 21: 15, "Feed my sheep." And I do not select this single passage, in order to defend the

power and authority of the Scriptures alone, but to demonstrate, that the opponents of the Pope find a true and proper sense agreeable to the Gospel, in the doctrine for which they contend over against the doctrine maintained by the adherents of the Pope. You doubtless know, worthy Master Nicolas, that holy Augustine has a discourse upon this thrice repeated question, and command to Peter, in which he says: "As Peter had thrice denied Christ, therefore, the Lord thrice asked him, whether he loved Him, and thrice exhorted him to feed His sheep. From which it appears, that Christ sought to remove from Peter the shame and reproach in which his denial involved him before the other disciples; so that Peter might not be despised by them on account of his infirmity and sin, as though he had thereby rendered himself unworthy of the apostolic office, notwithstanding that he fell rather in word and through fear, than with the heart, as appears from his melting into penitence immediately upon our Lord's turning his eye upon him." Whence it is seen, that Augustine regards these words not as exalting Peter to the primacy, but as simply restoring him to the dignity and confidence of the apostleship; which apostolical or pastoral dignity and honor belonged to all the disciples, as has been already sufficiently shown.

Christen. Inasmuch as Master Ulrich Zwingli supposes that this text of John 21: 15, "Feed my sheep," proves, according to Augustine's explanation, that, as Peter had thrice denied Christ, he was required thrice to avow his fidelity, and not that the keys were thus conveyed to him, as Christ had promised, I wish to reply: that the words of the Holy Scriptures are susceptible of many interpretations. I will, therefore, not contradict the explanation which Augustine gives in this case. But as Christ thus openly recognizes him as a shepherd, it is plainly to be understood, that He also gives him the authority of a shepherd to feed, to punish, to bind and loose; for to a shepherd belongs a crook, that is, authority over the sheep.

Zwingli. It is the pastor's duty to feed the flock, not to exercise lordship over it. Christ says, "Feed *my* sheep," not *thy* sheep. Both the sheep and the shepherd are the Lord's.

Jacob Edlibach, (also of Zofingen,) repeated what had already been said in favor of Peter's supreme authority, and was referred by Haller to the arguments which had been urged in reply. He then added yet, that the keys were transferred to Peter because he confessed that Christ was the Messiah, the Son of the living God. All the Apostles believed the same, and Peter merely made the confession in their name, wherefore the keys were not given to Peter alone.

Christen then proceeded to say—Although Christ is the chief Head and centre of authority in the Church, there are still, according to His command, to be other rulers, superiors, and heads, for the maintenance of order in the Church. I will not quarrel about the word "*head*;" either of the terms used has the same force as the others. Such supreme authority existed in the Jewish Church, and all disputes were referred to it for decision. Shall the Christian Church be less perfect in form than the Jewish?

Haller. The Church is not above Christ but subject to Him. The Scriptures know nothing of spiritual lords, but only of pastors, preachers, and ministers of the word. The constitution of the Church is prescribed in 1 Cor. 12: 4-6, and Eph. 4: 11. The priests of the Old Testament decided upon disputes not arbitrarily, but according to the fixed law of God.

Christen. Both, Head and Church, are incorporated with each other, and so inseparably united. Haller must produce Scripture to show that a Prelate or Bishop may not be head of the Church. Of course, they are not to be tyrannical rulers, but heads which teach, protect and punish, and also make provision for the temporal wants of the Church. 1 Cor. 4: 21, Paul says: "Shall I come to you with a rod, or in love?" (See also 2 Cor. 13: 1, etc.) If there were no discipline, but each one was allowed to do as he pleased, how should order be preserved? According to 1 Cor. 12: 5, there are "differences of administration." There must consequently be a superior, and those subject to him. In Heb. 13: 17, Paul exhorts to obedience to those "who have the rule over you; for they watch for their souls, as those who must give account."

Haller. None of the Apostles says Christ is incorporated with us, but, we are incorporated with Christ. What name does Scripture give for Prelates? "The rod," Paul explains as meaning the excommunication of adulterers, 1 Cor. 5. To reprove vices, and show the people their sins according to 2 Cor. 13: 1, etc., is the duty of every pastor. 1 Cor. 12: 5, as also Heb. 13: 17, refer to temporal authority. Above, (Heb. 13: 7,) the Apostle is speaking of such as are set over the congregation, with the explanation, "who have spoken unto you the word of God." Consequently no text has yet been adduced in favor of spiritual heads.

Christen protested against these remarks, as though he were unwilling to acknowledge Christ as our life and salvation. I know, he said, no Saviour, no Redeemer, but Christ Jesus, our Lord and Preserver.

Oecolampadius now remarked, that *Christen* seemed indeed unwilling to transfer the honor of Christ to any creature, and yet insisted upon having one head under Christ, a centre of authority limited to one person, as Peter and his successors, a Pope. Where there is but one head, however, it must be able to supply the wants of all the members; but this no man can do, wherefore there were many Apostles. Besides Christ, there can be no other spiritual monarch.

Christen. The second part of the Article now under discussion, affirms that "the Church is begotten of the word of God." But the Scriptures use the term, "word of God," in various significations, as: the eternal word, (John 1,) the written word in the Bible, the word preached, the secret word communicated to the heart by God. (Ps. 65: 9. 2 Cor. 13: 3.) Is it meant now that the Church is begotten of these combinedly, or of one in particular?

Haller. Briefly: The Church is born of that word of God which God invests with living power. He does indeed speak in our hearts, but not otherwise than in the word commanded to be preached, or the word as contained in the Holy Scriptures. James 1: 18. 1 Peter 1: 23.

Christen. But I am further constrained by the Scriptures

to hold, that a Christian is bound to receive and believe more than is expressed outwardly in the Scriptures, all things namely taught by the twelve Apostles. (2 Tim. 2: 2, and Titus 1: 5.) They taught and preached, and reported to others whatever they had received, without limiting themselves to the written word. It is further my opinion that the Holy Church existed previously to the Gospel, and the writings of the twelve Apostles, and will continue to exist throughout eternity, when there will be no longer a written word. In 2 Tim. 3: 16, Paul also says: "All Scripture which is given by God, is profitable," &c. Now it is well known, that many things were written by the holy saints after the Scriptures were written, in order to explain them and spread the knowledge of them; and my opinion is, that God may have communicated those things to the saints, especially such traditions as the universal Christian Church has accepted. It is also written, (Acts 15: 22-29, and 16: 4,) Ye shall keep the commandments of the twelve Apostles, and the appointment of the elders. And to the same effect Paul says, (1 Cor. 11: 2,) "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you;" and further promises, "and the rest I will set in order when I come." But we nowhere find these things recorded, although he doubtless kept his promise. He says also, 1 Cor. 7: 12, "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord," &c. Of such traditions as were not immediately written, we may also find some notice in 2 Thes. 2.

Zwingli. And what do you wish to prove by all this?

Christen. My object in quoting these passages, is this—Inasmuch as the rules for the regulation of this Disputation allow only of Scripture proofs, and of arguments based thereupon, I thought I would show how far we are justified by Scripture, in following such traditions as were not originally written, in observing the rules and customs of the ancient Christian Church.

Zwingli. The passage quoted from 2 Tim. 3: 16, has not been correctly translated by Master Nicolas: "Every Scripture is profitable to teach;" which is not at all the meaning of

Paul; for then we might maintain that everything ever written would be profitable, which of course can never be admitted. The meaning of Paul is, "Every Scripture which is given by the inspiration of God, (this is the language of the original text) is profitable for doctrine," &c. You perceive, therefore, beloved brethren, that the opinion already advanced by one of my worthy colleagues, remains unshaken, viz: that the Apostles preached and taught nothing but what was in accordance with the inspired Scriptures, and furthermore, that all divinely inspired truths were received by them as holy Scriptures, with this condition, that all the prophets, even unto John, ceased in the Lord Jesus Christ, Luke 16:16. Wherefore they receive no new reports of revelations, afterwards proclaimed, which disagree with what was written down to the time of Christ, and including the doings of Christ; for nothing can be allowed as of divine authority, which is not revealed in and by Christ, as the light of the law and the soul.

January 12.

Christen renewed his protestation that he acknowledged Christ as the Supreme Head, although he also acknowledged another head or other heads, as taught by the Scripture passages adduced. The honor of Christ is noway diminished by Kolb and Haller being called Bishops, as indeed Zwingli admitted. In Heb. 13, spiritual rulers are meant.

Haller. To be a head of the Church, is equivalent to being the source of vitality and salvation, which no human creature can be. A bishop and head are not the same thing. The Church is but one body and has but one head. The episcopal office among men, is limited to the external word, and can in no wise extend its power to the soul, unless by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit.

Christen. Christ, according to His Divine nature, existed before the Church, but not according to His human nature. The living Christian Church was formed at the Cross. Colos. 2:12, 13, Eph. 1:7, etc. The Church which existed before the advent of Christ, was not properly a living Church; for all the members of that Church were still under the wrath

of God, and not yet made partakers of grace unto salvation, but all of them at death, descended into the prison of purgatory.

Haller. The assertions of Christen betray so utter a misapprehension of divine things, that it seems to me he should carefully refrain from contending against the truth of God for which we are pleading. To God all future things are present; He knows whom He hath elected unto salvation from the foundation of the earth, (Eph. 1: 4.) So also was the death of His Son eternally present to Him. Wherefore he forgave the sins of Adam and Eve, of Abel, and all the saints who lived from the beginning, and granted unto them His Holy Spirit, and so permitted them, as well as us, to attain unto spiritual life in Christ, through faith, although He was not pleased so fully to reveal unto them the mysteries of the Gospel. (Eph. 3: 9.) Let Christen, therefore, prove by the Scriptures, that the Church of God, before the advent of Christ, was not a living Church, such as it became afterwards, and that its members continued under condemnation, and after death went down into purgatory. We hold that "the just shall live by faith," which faith all the saints from the beginning possessed, and that they were consequently justified by the merits of Christ, and departed, after this life, to rest with Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, and not to suffer in the prison of your fabricated purgatory. Although, as already said, the revelation of the Divine mercy became clearer after the advent of Christ; wherefore He says to His disciples: "Blessed are your eyes, for they see," &c.

Christen now declared that he would no longer continue *this* debate, but would leave these points to be disposed of by abler hands. If we are not allowed in this Disputation to introduce the writings of the holy Fathers, but must limit ourselves to the sacred Scriptures alone, and not even determine the sense of these by reference to the Fathers, I am at a loss how to proceed. I receive for truth whatever the Holy Catholic Church holds as such, and will live according thereto; for unto her is promised the Spirit of truth, and that Christ will be with her unto the end. He will not suffer her to err.

Haller. Even the greatest Apostles, Peter and Paul are ours, and not we theirs, but Christ's. They are but servants of the Church. The Church has but one Husband, otherwise she were not virtuous; but one Head, Christ. God be praised, that He hath so powerfully manifested His truth in our midst, that Christen must confess he cannot prevail against us if we are bound to the Holy Scriptures alone. He concedes, therefore, that our theses are founded upon the Bible. The Holy Catholic Church is formed of those only who hold the true faith of God, according to the word of God; to this they will firmly cling; with them Christ dwells, and His Spirit instructs them.

Daniel Schatt, priest of Gundiswyl, now resumed the argument. There are three things to be considered in Christ; the divinity alone, the humanity alone, and then the divinity and humanity united. Now I ask, is Christ to be regarded as the Head of the Church, according to His divinity alone, or His humanity alone, or His divinity and humanity combined?

Zwingli. Jesus Christ, true God and man, wherefore He is called Christ Jesus, is in both natures Head of the Christian Church, with this explanation, that according to His divine nature, He is especially and peculiarly the source of being for all things, and that in his human nature he made satisfaction, by an atoning sacrifice, for our sins, and thus reconciles to us the divine righteousness. In proof hereof, no Scriptures need be cited, but I may merely refer more particularly to the entire gospel of John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Schatt. That Christ is very God and man, and head of the Christian Church, is correct. But that little word "*only*," cannot be allowed. For, according to His divinity, He is one with the Father and the Holy Ghost. But these are three persons, viz: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and these three are the true actual head of the Christian Church, who governs the same, gives it life, preserves its life, and grants it salvation. Wherefore, it cannot be said that Christ *alone* is Head of the Christian Church, but He with the Father and Spirit.

Zwingli. Our worthy friend Schatt does not seem to know, that although there are three persons in the Godhead, these three constitute, nevertheless, but one God; and that consequently, when God the Father is spoken of, or God the Son, or God the Spirit, there is meant still but one God. Of this, however, it can assuredly not be necessary further to speak; for it seems like mockery, to indulge in such foolish quibbling before an assembly like this, on the part of those who pretend to split up the unity of the one God, in the style of which we have now had a specimen. The argument of Schatt is powerless. And until he produces some other person who is both very man and very God, our Lord Jesus Christ must remain the *only* true head of His Church, even if we had not brought forward Scripture authority for the word "*only*," which our records, nevertheless, will show has been done.

Schatt. The learned Master Ulrich Zwingli said at the commencement of his last speech, that I do not understand the nature of the unity of the divine Trinity. I must say, that in this he does me great injustice; for I have used the creed long enough in my prayers to know its meaning. And when he further repeats, what he said before, that the Son of God, begotten of His heavenly Father from all eternity, is the head of the Church, I also concede that. But when he affirms, that therefore Christ is the *only* head, I do not assent; because "*Christ*" is a title applied to the temporal nature of our Lord; as Christ he was born in time, as Luke testifies, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive," &c. Wherefore I assert, that Christ, according to his humanity, cannot be called the *only* head of the Christian Church.

Zwingli. This argument requires no answer. In my preceding remarks, I proved clearly that Christ is here taken for Him who is very God from all eternity, and in due time became man.

Schatt. Zwingli desires me to prove that the Church has another head besides Christ. This proof I find in 1 Cor. 11: 3, "The head of the woman is the man, but the head of Christ is God." There you have another head besides Christ, and consequently Christ is not the *only* head of the Church.

Zwingli. The words of Christ, "The Father is greater than I," teach plainly in what sense God is the head of Christ, namely, in reference to Christ's human nature, nisi velit hic inducere prioritatem originis, de qua apud Theologos, which, however, does not apply here. The passage already cited from 1 Tim. 6: 15, may also serve to explain and prove this point, in which we see that Christ is called "the blessed and only Potentate," instead of which word Potentate, we use the word Head.

Schatt. Well then, leaving the rest, I suppose we are to understand Master Ulrich as affirming, that, inasmuch as Potentates or Princes are synonymous with *heads*, they should be deposed.

Gilg Murer, minister in Rappersweil, now took Schatt's place, and said: It cannot be proven by Scripture, that there is no other power or authority besides Christ. In Rom. 13: 1, it is said, "There is no power but of God." If now all power or authority is of God, spiritual authority must also come from Him, and continue as long as Christianity itself endures.

Haller. That passage refers only to civil power.

Murer. Paul makes no exception—"all power."

Haller. That there is authority in the Church, I never denied according to the Scriptures; but to this no temporal head is required, but it is merely authority to teach and preach the word, &c.

Murer. I admit readily what Haller says, concerning authority in the Church for edification, by virtue of which we are commissioned to preach the word. But where there is authority, there must be officers to execute it. This I will show from the Old Testament. The Jewish synagogues represented the Christian Church, and they had Rulers. If now this type or figure shall be fulfilled, we must also have spiritual superiors in the Christian Church. And inasmuch as Jewish synagogues had not only one High Priest, but two, namely, Moses and Aaron; there must be something corresponding therewith in the New Testament. Accordingly, we have Christ and Peter. Proved by Exodus 4: 16.

Haller. Moses and Aaron were both figures of Christ.

Edelbach. Christ incorporated the Church with Himself, not the Church Christ. From Him, as Head, flow grace, wisdom, salvation, and all perfection and goodness. But the Pope is appointed as Head in the Church in order to govern her by virtue of the power of the keys given to Peter. The assertion of Bucer, that every church or congregation may take action upon what concerns the interests of the whole Church, is incorrect. For we know that the Church in Antioch, even when Paul and Barnabas were present, would not decide upon certain points before them, but sent the matter to Jerusalem, Acts 15; inasmuch as such things pertain to the Rulers of the Church.

Bucer. The declaration concerning the incorporation of the Church with Christ, I accept. As to the mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, it is my opinion, that the Church in Antioch had power to decide the matter, without appealing to any other authority. Inasmuch, however, as a controversy arose, and some malicious persons opposed the influence of Peter and James to the opinion of Paul and Barnabas, these preferred having the questions settled by other Apostles. Thus I think, also, that the Church in Bern had better received the sure word of God from their own ministers, (as doubtless many did,) without further debate. But as there were some among them who desired to hear the views of others, they resolved to hold this Disputation. Not that they will learn more from us, (even though each of our four thousand members were more learned and pious than Paul,) than their ministers could instruct them concerning divine things. Every Christian, and every single church must believe for themselves, and be assured of what the word of God teaches,—let others think as they please.

With these remarks the discussion of the first article closed.

J. H. A. B.

ART. V.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELLER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

I. ATTICA AND ATHENS.

The Scenery of Attica, its Productions, Climate and the Manners of its present Inhabitants.

ATTICA may be considered as a peninsula, in the form of a triangle, having for its base the mountain ridge of Cythæron and Parnes, on the north dividing it from Bœotia, and on both sides the Sea; on the east that part of the Ægean by the ancients called *Myrtoon Pelagus*, from the island Myrtos, and on the west the beautiful *Saronic* gulf, having its name from Saron, King of Trœzen, who perished in its waves. The prolongation of the western side northward, till it reached the base of the mountains, including the island of Salamis, served as the line of demarcation between the Athenian territory and that of the small independent State of Megara. But in earlier times, long before the great Doric invasion of the Peloponnesus, the frontiers of Attica, then called Ionia, being inhabited by the Ionian or Pelasgian race, extended as far as the Corinthian Isthmus, where, according to Strabo, the geographer, a *cippus*, or land-mark in the form of a pillar, was raised with the inscription, on the north side: *This is Ionia and not Peloponnesus*, and on the side of the isthmus: *Here is Peloponnesus and not Ionia*.*

Beautiful is the mountain scenery of Attica. The Cythæron rises steeply from the Corinthian gulf to a height of more than four thousand feet; its flanks are covered with pine and oak forests, which have given it its modern name *Elatia*,

* The pillar was destroyed by the Dorians during their conquest of Megara. A later imitation of the inscription we still read on the arch of Hadrian in Athens.

or Mount of Firs. Several defiles, celebrated in the military history of Greece, open a communication between Megara and Eleusis on the south, and Platææ and Thebes on the north. Eastward it joins the high woody Parnes, by the moderns called *Ozya*, from the fine beach-trees, which cover its northern slope. In the narrow and romantic passes, from which magnificent views extend toward the plains of Bœotia and the strait of Eubœa, or the plain of Athens and the islands of the Saronic gulf, we still admire the well preserved and picturesque ruins of the castles of Oince and Phyle, and the foundations of Decelia, so renowned in the times of the Peloponnesian war. Eastward the Parnes sinks steeply down on the strait of Eubœa forming a low promontory crowned with the ruins of the castle and temple of Rhamnus.

A brisk ride of three hours, or thirty miles, through valleys covered with fir, pine, arbutus, wild olive and myrtle, in picturesque variety, carries us down to the fertile, and now again highly cultivated plain of Eleusis, with many ruins of aqueducts and ancient structures scattered over its surface. It is divided from the still larger plain of the Cephissus by a low, barren ridge, Aegaleos, extending westward to the strait of Salamis, where it forms the promontory Amphiale, now *Skaramanga*, from the height of which Xerxes, the proud Persian King on his golden throne, beheld the destruction of his immense fleet in the year 480 B. C.

From Eleusis, around the gulf of Salamis, the Sacred Road, on which the solemn processions from Athens moved on to celebrate the mysteries of Ceres at her great Eleusinian temple, ascends through the defiles of Daphne near the ruins of a temple of Apollo situated in a laurel grove or *daphnon*, from which the pass itself received its modern name, and then descends upon the broad plain of Athens, bounded at a distance of twelve miles, by Mount Pentelicon on the east, Parnes on the north and Hymettus on the south. On the south-west the plain opens on the Saronic gulf, opposite to the islands of Salamis and Ægina. From the centre of this plain rises the steep prominent rock of the Acropolis, the Acropia of the

mythical times, with its undulating hills, the Areopagus, Museion, Pnyx, the more distant precipitous peak of Lycabettus and the lower ridge of Brilessus, now *Turkovouni*, losing itself north eastward in the plain. The Acropolis is lying five miles from the coast and presents, with its gold tinged temples, a bold and most beautiful relief against the huge masses of the purple Hymettus, hovering to a height of twenty-five hundred feet above the sea.

On the south of Hymettus the large inland plain, the *Mesogaion*, extends to the hills of Laurion, where the Athenians opened their rich silver mines. This ridge terminates with the high southern promontory of Sunion, by the mariners called *Caro Colonnas*, from the glittering marble temple of Minerva Sunias, crowning its summit. The view from beneath the columns is one of the most delightful in the world, extending across the dark blue waters of the Ægean and embracing an immense horizon, studded with the high and picturesque Cycladian islands. Thirteen columns of the Doric temple are still standing, with part of the architrave and the antæ of the cell. On one of the pilasters I read a curious inscription, apparently from the first century of our era, stating that Onesimos, here on the promontory, remembered his beloved sister.* We likewise see Lord Byron's name, by himself engraven on one of the columns. The western coast presents a continuation of low, rocky hills, barren and without cultivation; the eastern, on the contrary, is more diversified by craggy promontories, deep, indented bays, forming the fine harbors of Thoricus and Panormus and the glorious battle-field of Marathon, at the eastern base of Mount Pentelicon.

Attica is not a rich country, and nature has not granted it a fertile soil; its geological formation is primitive limestone, and its light, dry mould, therefore, produces only fruits, such as grapes, figs, oranges, lemons and olives, in great abundance and variety; but the stronger and more nourishing cereal grains, Indian corn, wheat, and barley, require diligent culture, and yield a scanty harvest. The tobacco raised on the plain

* Ονησιμος εμνεσθη της αδελφης χρηστης.

near the Peiræus, is aromatic and excellent, though inferior to the yellow *Rapnos*, from the hills of Argos and Volos, which vies with the celebrated Pasha-tobacuo of Turkey. Cotton and Indian corn (in Greece called Kalambokki and Arabositi) grow luxuriantly, where the fields can be irrigated during the dry summer months, as for instance on the banks of the Cephissus and the upper plain of Marathon. Barley is used as provender for horses, and the ancient custom, by the Hellenes called *Krastis*, and by the moderns *Krasidhi*, still prevails at Athens, of grazing the horses in the green barley fields during the months of April and May. You may then see hundreds of fine Thessalian steeds, belonging to the royal stables, the Greek chieftains, residing at the capitol, and the army, tethered in the verdant plain, whilst the grooms and military in attendance, are sitting in their showy dresses and red skull-caps, before their tents and arbors, ornamented with flags, where they smoke their chiboukies around the blazing fires and form quite animated and picturesque groups. The green pasture serves as a necessary restorative for the horses, which thus refreshed, are enabled to endure the oppressive heat and dust of summer, with renewed strength.

It is highly distressing to observe how averse the Greek farmer is to any of the useful agricultural inventions of western Europe; even the harrow, the roller, or threshing machine are entirely unknown to him, and he is still using the *classical* plough of old Hesiod, the Poet, three thousand years ago, a clumsy beam of crooked timber, with only one shaft, the plough-share of which is made of hard wood, seldom tipped with iron. The reaping is a time of rejoicing; the villagers gather in their harvest in common, and pile their corn around the open threshing-floor, *aloni*, where it is trodden by a number of horses, tied to a stake in the centre and driven around in full gallop.

"As with autumnal harvest cover'd o'er,
And thick bestrown, lies Ceres' sacred floor;
When round and round with never wearied pain
The trampling steers beat out th' unnumber'd grain."

This very ancient, oriental custom of having the corn trod-

den by unmuzzled oxen, we still witness both in Asia Minor and Palestine. The wheat ripens a month earlier in Attica than in other parts of Greece; generally in June, sometimes even in May; but being hardly sufficient for the country people themselves, the bread-stuffs for the provision of the present capital are still mostly imported from Trieste and Odessa. Even during the most brilliant period of the Athenian republic, the interval of seventy years, between the Persian and Peloponnesian war, when agriculture and civilization were at their height, but the population had risen disproportionately to the resources of the country, the Athenians imported their grains from Bœotia, Eubœa and Thessaly. Therefore, the fertile island of Eubœa and the flourishing Ionian colonies on the coast of Thrace and Asia Minor, which all were tributary to Athens, became of the highest importance to the city during the war with Sparta and the Dorians, when all the transports from the main land were cut off by hostile armies occupying the fortress of Dekelia, and all the passes of the mountains. And yet, on the other hand, has this unproductiveness of Attica, and its want of more substantial food, by its ancient historians, been considered as the principal cause of a remarkable phenomenon in history of which the Athenians were not a little proud, namely, that Attica never suffered from any permanent hostile invasion, and as Rome in Italy, owed its early development to the crimes of robbers and outlaws, so did Athens owe her independence to the poverty of her Pelasgian rustics. "Thus, by a singular fatality, were the two most civilized and powerful republics of antiquity founded by the wicked and the weak."* Nor did Attica enjoy this constant tranquility only during the early migrations of the different Pelasgian tribes, but even in a later period, while all Hellas was overrun and the Peloponnesus subdued by the war-like Dorians in the tenth century before our era. The conquerors, who had abandoned the rugged and barren valleys of Mount Pindus, directed their course southward to more fertile regions and they

* Athens by Sir W. Young. London, 1804, page 16.

preferred to settle on the beautiful plains of Argos and Messenia, and in the rich valley of Laconia, sooner than with toilsome labor, cultivate the more accessible, but dry and parched hills of Attica. Its rustic population, at that time, scattered about in open villages, without fortresses or any well organized political or military union, would have become an easy conquest to a Dorian invader, and both Thucydides and the witty Aristophanes, therefore, frequently rally at the haughty pride of their countrymen of being *Autochtones*, or aboriginal children of the Attic soil, who never had mixed their blood with any foreign nation.*

Yet, though Attica has no abundance of the more important necessities of life, benign nature has embellished it with other ornaments! All the ancients praise the luxuriant vegetation of shrubs and sweet scented flowers as more profuse on the lovely hills of Attica, than in any other part of Hellas, and the extraordinary productiveness of the sacred olive-tree, was by the pious Athenians esteemed as the gift of Pallas Athene herself, to her beloved region.

An important article of export, even at the present day, is the delicious honey; for

“Still his honied wealth Hymettus yields.”

This huge marble mountain is thickly grown with thyme, *tentiscus*, *agnus-castus*, myrtle, sage, and many other odorous shrubs and herbs, which sucked by the bees, produce a perfectly white and fragrant honey, considered superior to any in the Levant, and even to that of Mount Hybla near Syracuse in Sicily. The Athenians place the entire honey-comb on their breakfast table and eat the honey, together with its delicate cell. The monasteries on Hymettus and Pentelicon, and the villages in the plain, possess many thousand bee-hives in the chasms of the rocks, where they produce more than fifty

* The Athenians, before the times of Solon, wore their long hair braided on their fore-head in a cluster of curls, *krobylos*, which they stuck full of golden ornaments in the form of grasshoppers, because they regarded the *tettix* or *cicada*, as sprung from the Attic soil, and they considered as a sweet music the shrill and deafening noise which it makes in the olive groves during the burning heat of a summer day.

thousand *kila* of honey and five thousand *kila* of wax, giving a revenue of twenty thousand dollars.

"A better gift yet," says Xenophon, "is the abundance of costly marbles, of which the Athenians form the noblest statues of their gods and their magnificent temples,"—and indeed the pure white marble of mount Pentelicon, the blue marble of Hymettus, and the glossy black stone of Eleusis, are alike excellent, and of an easy access.

But the ancient republic possessed a still more important product of its soil, than the splendid marbles; I mean, the rich silver mines of Mount Laurion, the income of which, more than one hundred talents, or two hundred thousand dollars of our money, was justly considered by Xenophon and Aristotle as the best and most certain resource of the public revenue. If, therefore, we except the happy situation of Attica, its excellent and liberal institutions and the extraordinary mental superiority of its active and enterprising inhabitants, no other circumstance, perhaps, contributed so much to the prosperity of the State, as the possession of her mines. The power of Athens depended on her fleet, and her wealth on her foreign commerce. It was the produce of the Laurion silver mines, which first enabled her great statesman, Themistocles, to create the naval force of his native country, and nothing so much promoted her trade and credit, as the *purity* of her coin, which was everywhere exchanged with profit; while, on the contrary, other States of Greece, such as Sparta and Thebes, were circulating a metal, current *only* at home. This wise arrangement was, no doubt, in a great measure, called forth by the possession of silver mines, within the territory of the republic herself. For centuries they were worked with great activity, but in the age of Demosthenes we already meet with loud complaints of unsuccessful speculations in mining, and in the first century of our era, they appear to have become exhausted. Strabo, the geographer, therefore, remarks, that in his time the poorer ore, which formerly had been removed and thrown aside, was *then* melted together with the scoria, from which metal had been but imperfectly separated by the ancient Athe-

nians, and that in this manner a considerable quantity of silver was extracted by the more careful process of the practical Romans; as we find it similarly repeated in some of the now exhausted mines in South America and Mexico. Near the ruins of an Hellenic castle, on the woody hills of Laurion, the deep shafts and pits sunk in the rock are so numerous, that travelling there by night would be attended with almost certain destruction, owing to the narrow opening of the shafts, which are concealed by shrubs and bushes. The scoria is still lying about in large heaps, and seem to have been melted down on the spot, where the silver-ore was produced.

These dangers to which the traveller is exposed on Mount Laurion, remind us of another serious accident, which happened to a party of gentlemen, with whom we, for the first time, visited the mines in the year 1837. On a bright and beautiful day in December, during the Christmas vacations, some of the professors of the Colleges, the Danish architects, and several Bavarian physicians and officers, took a ride to the promontory of Sunion. Having during the day enjoyed the delightful view from the temple-ruins and visited the shafts, we in the evening arrived at the village of Keratiæ, situated at the base of Mount Laurion, where the Greek archimandrite, Pappa Nikolas offered us the hospitality of his house for the night. As we had been on horse-back all day and the chilly night-breeze came whistling most uncomfortably through the ruinous dwelling of the Greek pappas, the gentlemen proposed to take some warm restorative, and there being plenty of oranges and lemons in the village, our servants were ordered to make some hot punch. Supper had in the mean time been served, and part of the evening spent with song and lively conversation, when on a sudden the whole party began to feel so exceedingly ill, that the physicians at once pronounced that we had been poisoned. And indeed it was soon discovered, that our servants, searching, with some difficulty, for a large kettle, had borrowed one from a neighbor, which had not been tinned and was covered inside with *vers-di-gris*. In this dilemma, a stout, old Albanian shepherd entered, and learning our sad accident, re-

plied, that this was a common occurrence, and that he soon would find a remedy. He then hurried away to the *mandra* or sheep-fold, on the outskirts of the village, and quickly returned with some large vases of fresh goats milk, which indeed proved an excellent antidote, and enabled the sufferers next morning to return to Athens; but none of them afterwards ever travelled through Greece without carrying their bright copper-kettle, well tinned, slung on the saddle behind them.

Not only the poets, historians and orators vied with one another in praising the beauty of their native land, nay, even the Olympian gods themselves disputed and strove for the possession of Attica! A tradition of high antiquity says, that Neptune first claiming his right to a region which so long had been covered with his waves, fixed his trident on the rock of the Acropolis, from which a salt-spring issued forth, while the prudent Minerva, devising another gift more conducive to the prosperity of its inhabitants, planted the Olive, ever afterwards venerated in her sanctuary on the castle-hill. The sea-god then offered the horse, but Minerva, cunningly, by a quick glance, induced the hero Erichthonios to attach the steeds to her chariot and hurry away with them! Cecrops and the assembled gods then awarded the prize to Pallas Athene, and the irascible Neptune, in revenge, launched his terrible trident and submerged the Thriasian plain, which afterwards formed the gulf of Salamis. This rivalry of the gods, which so poetically expresses the early tastes and occupations of the Athenians before the Persian war, some devoting themselves to foreign commerce and maritime expeditions, while the mass preferred the quiet vocations of the ploughman and shepherd, was represented in splendid colossal statues by the master-hand of Phidias, on the western pediment of the Parthenon.

The horse of Neptune never prospered in Attica; it required the rich pastures of Bœotia and Thessaly. The Athenians, therefore, had no Cavalry in the battle of Marathon, and even later, during the Peloponnesian war their horse consisted only of twelve hundred young, rich knights or *hippeis*, and some squadrons of Thessalian auxiliaries. At the present day, the

Royal Studs or *hippotrôpheia*, are situated in the plain of Argos, where a large number of fine colts are raised for the service of the army.

The Olive was the glory of Attica, and her most valuable product. Its cultivation was encouraged by the Solonian laws, which threatened the infliction of severe penalties to whoever injured that precious tree. The sacred Olive from the Erechtheion, had, according to the belief of the pious Athenians, by the agency of the goddess herself, been propagated to the grove of the Academy on the banks of the Cephissus, and from thence to other parts of Attica, where it was attended with particular care. It was called *moria*, and produced the holy and Panathenaic oil, which, as the highest prize, was presented to the victor at the public games, both in Greece and Italy, in a beautifully ornamented vase, having the curious inscription: "*I am one of the prizes from Athens.*"

When the Athenians fled from their city and the temples on the Acropolis were burnt and destroyed by the Persians, the prisoners, with astonishment, beheld fresh scions shooting forth from the roots of the Sacred Plant, which they hailed as a propitious omen of final victory. Even the Spartans, during their devastating incursions in Attica, spared the Olive-groves with religious reverence. So did the Turks, and for centuries they remained the wealth and pride of the Athenians, but the war of independence has made a deplorable havoc among the fine Olive woods of the plain. Hundreds of old trees have been cut down, no young ones planted, and their large open glades are now laid out in vineyards or melon gardens. We felt greatly disappointed at this indifference of the modern Athenians, to restore and cultivate their precious Olive-groves, while in many other parts of Greece, as for instance, in Messenia and Laconia, we, with intense pleasure, visited the nurseries, *phyteiae*, of young trees, reared with the utmost care by the Moreotes, for the transplantation of the scions. Like their forefathers, they engraft the wild Olive; and on Mount Zavitzia in Argolis, we behold the interesting sight of entire forests of wild Olive trees in the different degrees of their domestication.

The American traveller, being accustomed to the deep and florid verdure of his native forests, generally considers the pale, silvery tints of the Olive devoid of beauty.

"It possesses neither the majesty of the forest-tree," says Mr. Hillhouse, in his valuable article on the Olive, "nor the gracefulness of shrubbery. It clothes the hills without adorning them and considered as an accident in the landscape, it does not change the picture sufficiently to contribute to its beauty. The rich culture for which the southern provinces of France are celebrated, is less conducive to rural beauty than some of the humbler species of husbandry. The richest country is not always the most lovely; a country of mines, for example, is usually ungracious to the eye, and the Olive is called by an Italian writer, a mine upon the surface of the earth."*

This statement is certainly just, with regard to the dwarf Olive of France, which only in the celebrated valley of Vaucluse, near Avignon, has something like an Italian character. Yet, in order to see the Olive in its full development and beauty, the traveller must descend to Italy and Greece. Already the average produce of the Olive in Provence, of ten pounds of oil, compared to that of the larger trees in Greece, of three hundred pounds, will show the difference. There the Olive is a large, elegant and eminently beautiful tree. The extensive Olive-groves of Attica, Laconia, Messenia, and the Grecian Islands, where the bright, silvery color of the Olive, intermingled with the cypress and orange, stands in the most beautiful contrast to the deep verdure of the vineyards beneath,

* The North American Sylva by Michaux. Paris, 1819. Vol. II, page 172. The European Olive was successfully cultivated in East Florida, at New Smyrna, on the west bank of the Mosquito river, where an Englishman, Mr. Turnbull, had founded a settlement of Greeks and Minorquies. William Bartram, who visited the colony in 1775, describes its beautiful situation in an extensive Orange-grove, and the thriving condition of the town. But the poor Greeks were soon driven to despair by continual hardships and the oppression of the Spaniards. They abandoned their new home, and, courageous as their forefathers, some of them attempted, in an open boat, to cross over to Havana, while the rest cut their way through the savage Indians and reached St. Augustine.

In 1783, a few decayed cottages and a number of large Olive-trees, were the only remaining traces of Grecian industry in America. Vide Michaux, *ibid.* p. 199.

and the violet hues of the rocky summits above; there they present that rich and picturesque southern landscape, so enthusiastically admired by the poet and painter; there the groves of Minerva, by the soft and yet distinct outlines and variegated shades of the masses, give the true character to the classical soil, which our imagination delights to people with the grand and venerable visions of antiquity.

Before the Turkish war, forty oil mills, of an almost primitive form, and driven by mules, were in activity at Athens; they yielded an average produce of five hundred thousand *kila* of an excellent oil. Six thousand barrels, worth one hundred thousand dollars, are exported every year, mostly to Constantinople and Russia.

The Turks of Athens, being a sedentary and indolent people, are fond of gardens with purling fountains and shady bowers; they surround their mosks with clusters of fine plantanes; their burial grounds are dense thickets of dark cypresses, and everywhere they rear the palm in memory of their prophet and oriental origin. All these Turkish gardens, so beautifully described by Lord Byron, have vanished, together with their harems and cemeteries; yet two elegant palm-trees still adorn the city of Athens, and the lifeless seated stem of a third is seen on the Acropolis. The palm is rare in Greece; on the islands of the *Ægean*, principally at Naxos, Paros and Santorin, entire groups of these graceful trees embellish the landscape, and give it an oriental character, but their dates do not attain maturity, and it is not until you land at Acre, Yafa, or on the banks of the Nile, that you enjoy the first exciting and enrapturing sight of a palm-grove.

Attica is a dry country; it has neither lakes nor rivers, and the torrents, descending from the mountains, flow only during the winter season and dry up in summer. This is the case with the celebrated Ilissus, losing itself in the fields south of Athens, and the scanty rivulets of Marathon and Eleusis. The Cephissus bursting forth from a beautiful source at the base of Mount Pentelicon, has, on the contrary, a perennial stream, not always fordable in winter, but during summer led off by numer-

ous channels to irrigate the gardens and vineyards in the environs of the city.

Beautiful are the walks on the woody banks of the Cephissus, when on the stillness of the evening, the nightingale, the lovely Philomele, is heard warbling through thickets of laurel, myrtle and oleander. Nothing can be more delightful than the calm, bright moonlight nights at Athens. The Attic sky is the most transparent, the most brilliant and deeply violet in the Levant; there is a charm thrown over all the distant objects on that clear horizon, which we have seen nowhere so perfect on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The plain being on three sides surrounded by lofty mountains, the winter at Athens is colder than at Smyrna, or on the islands of *Ægean*. The north wind, the fierce Boreas, sweeping down from Mount Cythæron is chilly, and we have often in the early morning hours felt more uncomfortably cold in our airy wood-built house in the Peiræcus than in the cheerful domicile of Lancaster; but the glorious winter-sun rising gorgeously above Mount Hymettus, soon dispels the freshness of the morning, and a bright, warm and sunny winter day in the plain of Athens is as agreeable as the loveliest May day on the hills of Pennsylvania.

The fields in Attica, during the winter season, are covered with a rich carpet of flowers. The olive, orange, and lemon groves, the laurel, myrtle, cypress and oleander, together with a great variety of other ever-greens, vie in freshness and beauty, while the high snow-capped mountains around glitter in all the pomp and majesty of Alpine regions.

This luxurious vegetation continues during April and May; at every step on Mount Parnes we meet with the wild hyacinth, the lily, the crocus; the plain whitens with the asphodelus, the bulbous root of which was eaten by the ancient Pelasgi, according to the statement of Hesiodus. At the present day this plant is used in the French sugar manufactories at Thermopylæ and yields eight and ten per cent. of an excellent white sugar.

The banks of the rivulets are adorned with the purple *olean-*

der and the blue and white *agnus castus*. Vegetables, such as cauliflower, beans, peas, artichokes, salads, and many others, succeed one another throughout the season. Summer, on the contrary, presents a bleak and parched landscape, but an abundance of all kinds of southern fruits in their full perfection. The joyous period—the most pleasant in Greece, as in America—is the fall, the season of the vintage, *o trigos*, in the month of September, though the grapes begin to ripen so early as July. The general gathering of the olives begins in November and continues to February, every second year. The grapes for the wine-press are, in Greece, kept low on the ground, like in Sicily, but those reserved for the table the Greeks draw on poles along the front of the houses, or across the streets, where they form beautiful and shady bowers. The late Turkish war has destroyed all the splendid vine-bowers, *klimatezia*, on the Baazars of Athens; but on the islands of Naxos, Paros and Santorini, the inhabitants still pass from one street to another beneath their shady and fragrant canopy. A single cluster of these immense grapes often weigh seven *okhas*, or fourteen pounds, which is quite a sufficient desert for the numerous guests at a dinner party.

The vineyards in Attica are not separated by fences; they cover the whole plain, as a continual garden, and each owner knows his own lot by piles of stones and other marks.

During the vintage season a watch, *phylax*, is placed on a high poplar, overlooking the fields. Among its branches he fastens some mats, forming an awning against the sun; there he is seen sitting all day long with his long Albanian rifle resting in his arm and smoking his pipe. During the night his fierce wolf-dogs scour the vine-gardens, and woe to the imprudent wanderer or grape-thief who then approaches the forbidden fruits. An English sea captain, who, in 1839, visited Athens, and late at night, perhaps in a somewhat frolicsome mood, after a good dinner with the British Consul, John Green, crossed from the high-road into the vineyards, was torn to pieces, and so entirely devoured by the dogs, that only his skull, some knawed bones and his blue coat with brass buttons

was found the next day, to the amazement of Court and Capital. When the watch in the day time leaves his aerial mansion and goes to the Baazar in search of his provisions, he generally places his dogs in the mat, and we have often beheld the curious sight of a wild, shaggy shepherd's dog, barking, snarling and furiously springing about in the top of a lofty plane tree, without any possibility of getting down.

During the month of July the heat of Athens rises to 100, 105, and even sometimes to 112 degrees of Fahrenheit, in the shade; but the atmosphere is then refreshed morning and evening by the delicious sea breeze, *embatis*, which from the Saronic gulf, breathes softly over the plain. In winter the thermometer generally stands between 58 and 48 degrees; when it happens, however, that it descends to 40 degrees, or even lower, then the Greeks, enveloped in their shaggy capotes, disappear from the streets and public places and bemoaning the horribly cold winter—*o tromeros chemon*—shut themselves up in their dwellings unfit to undertake anything.

In Athens and the principle cities on the coast, the foreigners have now begun to introduce iron stoves, *sobas*, and other comforts of European life; but their use is not universal; the Greeks content themselves with their small earthen brasier, called *παγγατι*, filled with live coals. In Constantinople and in the houses of some families at Athens, who still adhere to the old oriental manners, this fire-pot is replaced by a large brazen vase, *tandauri*, standing in the middle of the room or beneath a table which is covered with a large table cloth, hanging down on all sides. The family, young and old, then sit around on low taborets and place their feet beneath the tablecloth, while the person who may be more suffering will raise the cloth over his shoulders and thus warm all his body. These precautions are needless on the islands, and we have spent several winters on Elgeria, Zante and in Symrna, with open windows and without ever kindling a fire in our study.

The immense snow-crowned and precipitous mountains of Greece impart a grandeur to the scenery, which we look for in vain in Italy, where the outlines are more level and less striking,

but on the other hand, the atmosphere is in Italy more impregnated with light vapors, the exhalations of which, beneath the warm and genial sun, diffuse a glorious coloring of mellow tints, which the elastic transparency of the dry air on the Grecian table-lands cannot produce. This is particularly the feature in the scenery of the higher mountain regions of Arcadia, Phocis and Epirus. But on the plains of Athens and Sparta, on the lakes of Bœotia, and on the islands, these highly colored, warm, purple and violet hues are seen in all their intensity and splendor, as Lord Byron so truly says, in his description of the Corinthian gulf:

Where the tints of the earth and the hues of the sky
In color though varied—in beauty may vie,
And the *purple* of ocean is deepest in die.

This transparency of the atmosphere in Greece, is really astonishing to every northern and even American traveller. All objects at a distance, mountains, towers, trees, high on the summits of the rocks, present themselves with such a clearness, and their outlines detach themselves, as it were, so distinctly from their background, that you would suppose them to be situated much nearer, than they are in reality. Often during our excursions on the hills of Attica and the Morea, we have remarked this curious phenomenon, and sometimes, weary with a long ride, and observing on the slope of an opposite mountain, the convent or village, where we intended to encamp for the night, we would have supposed it to be quite near at hand, from the perfect distinctness with which every object could be recognized—and yet, it would cost us many a toilsome hour's ride, before we, late at night, could reach our resting place.

“The extreme parts of the earth”—says the father of history, old Herodotus—“have, I do not know how—received the most benign gifts of nature. India possesses the most gorgeous birds, the largest quadrupeds and trees, which, instead of fruits produce the finest wool. Persia has the fleetest steeds; Arabia frankincense, myrrh, and precious spices; Æthiopia gigantic elephants and impervious forests—nay, even the remotest shores of Europe furnish tin and precious amber, and

the uncouth Arimaspi, in the hoary north, have plenty of gold; but Hellas, kind nature has granted the brightest and most genial of climates, and *man* in his greatest perfection and beauty."

The dry and temperate climate, and the almost constant serenity of the Attic sky have essentially contributed to preserve the elegant monuments of Hellas and the happy and lively disposition of her spirited inhabitants. They are a healthy, vigorous race, still retaining the full antique form alike perceptible in the regularity of their features, the animated expression of their countenance, and easy independence of their carriage. The men of the main land and the women of the islands, present the true type of classical beauty; it fades more rapidly among the females, while the hardy mountaineer often in his eightieth or nintieth year, still follows his wont occupations in the fields and the chase. Thus the venerable Notaras, of Corinth, in the 110th year of his age, presided at the opening of the National Assembly in 1848. Little children languish during the summer heat at Athens; many die, and all the more independent families generally retire to the Convents on Mount Hymettus during July and August. Fever, *pyretos*, is the most prevailing disease which is brought on by the exhalations of the marshes, or by want of precaution, exposure to the sun, or night air, or irregularity of diet. Consumption, rheumatism and pulmonary complaints are almost unheard of; many an invalid has recovered his health in the mild and delightful climate of Greece, and if thousands of Philhellenes and Bavarians have perished, they themselves were, by their intemperance, the cause of their death.

Thus the chorus in Euripides, hails the ancient Athenians: "Ye god-like sons of Erechtheus, who in your sacred, never conquered native land, nurtured in the noblest science of wisdom and virtue, breathe the purest air, beneath the brightest skies, where the nine sisters, the gifted muses, leaving their chaste retreat on the Pierian mountain, have planted among you their golden seat of harmony and love!"

Such was the land of fair Athens and the pleasant climate,

which the Olympian gods had granted her. Such it is even to this day, and we may rejoice that the Muses, whom the revolutions and devastations of twenty centuries had frightened away to the west, have once returned to their beloved hills of Attica, where they again, under the mild government of a noble minded prince, king Otho, the Beloved, spread light, love and harmony among her lately so distracted and unhappy sons.

Our next article will give an outline of the little known, but not uninteresting history of Athens, during the middle ages.

A. L. K.

Lancaster, Pa.

ART. VI.—GOVERNMENT IN ITS RELATION TO EDUCATION.

SOCIETY is not a community of individuals who have voluntarily united for the purposes of convenience or mutual advantage. An individual is not an independent being, who if he chooses to do so, may ignore his connection with his fellows, sever the ties that bind him and them mutually, and still be himself. He is an integral part of a great whole, upon which he depends in every period of life—he is a member of a family, in living connection with which alone can he find the conditions absolutely necessary to the felicitous and harmonious development of his whole nature.

Men, accordingly, do not live together in a state of civilized society, because they feel convinced that such an arrangement is a matter of great convenience. All the tendencies of their inner being, determine them to be social long before they can at all reflect upon the comparative advantages of complete isolation and of society. It does, indeed, confer innumerable blessings, but it has also many ills and inconveniences, that har-

rass the mind and pierce the heart ; a perfectly sane man, however, will not think of taking refuge to the life of a hermit, and drag out a lazy existence among owls and snakes and lizards and worms ; convenient or inconvenient, advantageous or disadvantageous, a man that is a man cannot be content and happy but by living among men.

Nor do men live in a state of society because they have chosen to do it, that is, if they did not will to be members of society they might as readily resolve to exclude themselves from it, and yet fulfil the conditions and accomplish the objects of life. We might as well speak of a hand without a body, or of a limb without a tree. Before any act of volition has been put forth, or before it is even possible to do so, human nature is inclined to social life by every faculty or principle inherent in it. Supposing it possible that an individual might deliberately determine to seclude himself from all the walks of life and abide where no one else abides, yet he could not do even this unless he had grown up and been matured in the very state and under the very circumstances which he abjures. Before a man can think at all, or resolve upon this or that course, he must already be a member of a social body. For it is only when he occupies this relation that reason and will can be developed. A human being is not like an ox. He may be seized in the days of his calf-hood, and separated for life a thousand miles from all of his tribe ; yet if he is well stabled and well fed and well trained, he will be as large, as cheerful, as strong, as wise and as contented, as if he had roamed with the wild herd amid the uninhabited mountain forests. To all intents and purposes he will be as really an ox as if he had possessed all the advantages of intimate fellowship with his species. But a man can only become a man when the development of his intellectual and moral powers, is subject to those living influences, which none but man can exert. Separate him in his childhood from all association with his race, and let him grow to the age of manhood under the influences of irrational nature, and he becomes a monster. Hence the resolution on the one hand to abandon a state of seclusion, and on

the other to constitute a body politic, presupposes the existence of society. The resolution is after the fact ; volition or choice does not originate a social state.

If these positions be tenable, it follows also that society is not the result of a tacit or formal compact entered into by single and totally independent individuals. In order to form a just conception of a civil compact we must presuppose the actual existence of social life. If men were by nature independent ; if there were no laws of their being in virtue of which they are allied to each other and bound together ; if there were no instincts nor tendencies whatever, that necessarily demand a union and communion of the human family, human nature would be destitute of a sufficient basis upon which an *idea* of organized society common to all could rest and from which it could be developed. But if men are mutually dependent upon each other ; if, as every intelligent, reflecting mind must admit, they are bound together indissolubly by all the laws of physical and intellectual life ; if men possess instincts, tendencies and wants, forming a part of their very constitution which demand for their satisfaction a social state, then both the existence and the necessity of society under some form are anterior to all compact.

We may discuss this point under a different aspect. In order that men may enter into a compact either tacitly or formally, two things are essential. There must, in the first place, be some general law to bind the parties that enter into a mutual agreement, otherwise the agreement could have no power over the will and conscience. In the next place, the authority of this general law must be acknowledged and respected by all who are, or become members of the association. A compact where these great principles do not operate is mere idle wind. To bind the will or conduct of men by words when they are ignorant of, or refuse to acknowledge the authority and inviolability of law, existing before and independently of all formal agreement, would be as vain as it was for the lords of the Philistines to bind the long-haired Samson with seven green withs. These, however, are the very principles that constitute

society what it is. They are its essential elements. It cannot exist unless they are acknowledged, and where they are acknowledged it exists necessarily. If, now, in order to enter into a compact, men must acknowledge the authority and inviolability of law binding equally on all; and if such an acknowledgment already implies the existence of some form of organized society, it involves a flat contradiction to say that civil society originates in the formation of a civil compact. It is nothing less than to put the consequent for the antecedent, and thus to contradict every principle that a sound theory of civil compact implies.

How then does society originate? It results from the constitution of humanity. The nature of human life is such, that with its development both the idea of society is unfolded and its actual existence realized.

The constitution of body and mind embodies certain unalterable laws that as they operate, necessarily call forth a state of society. Society, viewed in this light, must, therefore, be regarded as divine. Every natural law, whether of body or mind, is but an expression of the will of God in its relation to humanity, determining it to be what it is. The organic connection of these laws with their common life-principle establishes what may be called an *order*, or the original constitution of humanity. Such constitution is, consequently, not something arbitrary, accidental or contingent; but it is what infinite wisdom and power willed it to be. The will of God, as embodied in human nature, and indicated by its inherent tendencies, gives rise to the idea of society and demands its actualization.

Thus society takes its origin in an objective and necessary principle; *objective*, because the principle is independent of the will or choice of single individuals, communities or nations; it lies at the foundation of an order ordained by Almighty God. Men are subject to the control of physical and moral laws before they can reason or will; in like manner are they subject to the control of certain deeply-seated laws of their being which determine them to be members of civil society before they are

self-conscious. In other words, every individual, man or woman, is a social being, in virtue of the constitution of humanity, established by the absolute will of an omnipotent Creator. This principle is also *necessary*; because mankind cannot fulfil the design of their creation—cannot enjoy physical or moral happiness, except in as far as they possess the rights and perform the duties guaranteed and imposed by organized society. The will is free to determine or modify, within certain limitations, the form of social life. But the question: Shall we live in a state of society? can never be answered in the negative; nor can certain all pervading principles ever be ignored or violated, without proving fatal to its whole design. The nature and necessity of society are, consequently, revealed; not revealed supernaturally, like the decalogue of Moses on Sinai, but revealed in the constitution of humanity as such, like the necessity and order of the four seasons in the constitution of the planetary system. Yet the form under which it shall hold is conditioned by enlightened reason and free will. As an illustration, I may say: The necessity of cultivating the earth in order to a comfortable subsistence and the general principles upon which a successful cultivation must be conducted, are revealed by God, not supernaturally, but by means of laws ordained by Him in the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, a knowledge of which men acquire by observation and experience; yet the size and aspect of fields, the relative position of house and farm, the mode of tilling the soil, sowing grain and gathering in the harvest, as well as the general management of a given farm, depends upon the intelligence, taste, resources and free will of the proprietor.

My object in dwelling briefly upon the origin and necessity of society, has been to prepare the way for the consideration of another topic closely allied to it, namely, *the design of society*. Different theories prevail, to which it will be proper to refer. Some say it is the design of the State to protect life and property. Single individuals could not resist the united strength of a band of wicked men, disposed to rob, plunder and murder. It is necessary to associate together for the sake

of personal safety. Others say, it is the object of the State to promote the general welfare of mankind. Each one has numerous wants, the satisfaction of which requires the presence and labors of others. The measure of human happiness would be narrowed down within a small compass but for the aid which many associated individuals afford each other mutually. By combining their influence and labors upon the basis of a certain system of law, adopted by all, the general welfare may be greatly promoted, whilst the rights of individuals and communities are preserved inviolate. Other theories are advanced, but they are only modifications of those stated, the general features being the same. Neither one is entirely false, but they do not exhaust the subject, nor cover the whole ground. Whilst the object of the State certainly includes the security of person and property, the possession of liberty, and the promotion of human happiness, it must include besides a great deal more.

The design of society, or of the State, is directly connected with the nature of its origin. If its origin cannot be found in the free will of mankind, but in an objective principle that exerts a determining influence prior to all exercise of volition, then its ultimate design cannot be simply what men resolve to make it. If, by an arbitrary exercise of will, we endeavor to make it subserve a purpose that does not fully correspond with the demands of human nature, we are guilty of a perversion of society. Society has its own ends which it becomes us to ascertain by the study of human nature, of history and of divine revelation. These ends (or the design of the State) are determined by the nature of the necessity in which it takes its origin. What does this objective necessity demand? Deducing an answer from the train of thought which has thus far been pursued, the only reply must be this: The laws of human life produce society as the immediate result of their legitimate operation; and, therefore, in such a state alone can men be men—in it alone can they secure those necessities of life, those comforts and conveniences, which are becoming the dignity of a creature infinitely superior to the brute,—in it alone can the

wonderful powers of the body and the still more wonderful faculties of the mind be thoroughly disciplined, harmoniously developed and fully matured—in it alone can knowledge, refinement, individual and moral elevation, as well as the arts and sciences, to the cultivation of which men are predestinated by the absolute will of the Creator, as expressed in every lineament of their whole being, obtain—in it alone, therefore, can men accomplish the object of existence, the object for which they are created, preserved, redeemed, and for which all the blessings, both of Providence and the Gospel, are conferred upon them. Without it they might indeed live; but it would be a life more wretched and degrading than that of the Hottentots, Bushmen or Esquimaux; a life like that of the beasts of the field, but not like that of the sons of God. The design of society, accordingly, must be as comprehensive as the necessity in which it originates—as comprehensive as the individual and social, the bodily and mental, the temporal and spiritual wants of the human race. In other words, the design can be nothing less than to establish and maintain an external order of human life that will enable men to realize the end of their being on earth, and at the same time serve directly to promote this end. The design of human existence, of human society and of human government, are all one and the same. Society is that organic order of human life in virtue of which life itself, if all the conditions be present, may accomplish its object. Government is the organ of society, by whose authority and power society is maintained, advanced, and perfected. Or I may say, that human society, organized under some specific form of government, is the medium by which humanity, blessed with civilization and the Gospel, actualizes its own idea or fully unfolds its hidden sense—a result that is effected, whenever society and government are true to the obligations imposed by the nature of their vocation.

An object so comprehensive and far-reaching, as a matter of course, involves the substance of the theories to which we have referred. The security of person and property, by the enactment and execution of a wisely matured system of civil laws,

as well as the relief of human suffering and the promotion of general happiness, are all directly interwoven with it. The security of person and property are among the essential requisites to the very existence of society. The prevalence of tranquility and the possibility of promoting one's earthly comfort and happiness, are conditions without which neither society can progress nor government be prosperous. These objects, however, are not final in their nature ; but subordinate to another that is higher, greater, and more apposite to the dignity of man, namely, the satisfaction of all his physical, moral and spiritual wants. If a nation, with a good government at its head, is conscious of its real position in the scale of being, and will seek with steady purpose to regulate all the departments of social and political life with direct and exclusive reference to the intellectual and moral elevation of all, then every other object of minor importance, that is consistent with the will of the Creator, will be attained as a matter of necessary consequence.

The question may now be put : In what way may this great and noble design of society be realized ? What course must the various classes of community and of government adopt and pursue ? To give a correct reply to this question, it is requisite to take a glance at the general divisions of society and notice their mutual relations.

There are three grand divisions of all well regulated society. These give rise to three general classes, in some one of which all the various sub-divisions are directly or indirectly included. They may be styled, first, the *productive* and *nourishing* class ; secondly, the *governing* and *defending* class ; and thirdly, the *instructing* class. To the first belong farmers, who cultivate the soil, mechanics, who prepare the products of the earth for the use of men generally, and merchants who attend to the business of trade and commerce, and thus provide any given community with all the agricultural and mechanical productions of different countries. To the second belong the soldiery, but more particularly, the legislative, judicial and executive departments of the State. To the third class belong all those

who are engaged in training the mind, or imparting religious instruction, or are devoted to the promotion of Arts, Literature, Science and Religion ; in other words, teachers of common or high schools, professors and instructors in colleges and seminaries, poets, philosophers, historians, artists and ministers of the Gospel. Although each class is not equally important, yet each class is essential to the welfare of society. One can be dispensed with or its interests be allowed to suffer as little as another. They are integral parts of a living organism—the State. When one suffers all must suffer. When one is favored judiciously and prospers, all will receive an impulse. So intimately connected, they must rise together or fall together. As portions of the commonwealth, they are like the different members or the different systems of the human body. A disease of the hand or of the eye, will directly or indirectly affect the health or vigor of the foot or of the ear. A disease of the nervous system, will derange, sympathetically, the natural action of the muscular system. So with the State. If the producing class is oppressed, the sinews of the other classes will soon lose their strength and activity. If the governing class be incompetent or inefficient, or if their just authority be denied or resisted, insecurity and disorder will ensue and the interests of agriculture, commerce, science and morals will retrograde. If the instructing class is not qualified for its work of moulding the mind, promoting sound morals and extending true religion, or if it is not aided properly by the power of government, nor sustained by the sympathy and support of the community at large, the very foundations upon which the whole social fabric rests will begin to totter.

To secure general prosperity, one class must not be indifferent to the others, and labor mainly for its own aggrandizement. But the nature of the case requires, that each should labor faithfully in its appropriate sphere, put forth its energies to further the interests of the others, and all mutually co-operate with a view to advance the highest good of the whole. In this way the great end of organized society will be attained ; the physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual wants of man-

... kind will be satisfied, and, as the effects of sin and ignorance are gradually removed, intelligence and virtue, contentment and happiness must prevail in all the walks of social life.

I might now pass on to illustrate more specifically the reciprocal influence of these several classes upon each other. But this is not a part of my intention. It is my desire, to direct particular attention to *the duty which government owes to the cause of general education*. The method of argumentation that has been adopted, serves to illustrate the subject in a general way, and affords us principles from which some special considerations can be deduced, in favor of the position, that it ought to be one of the first objects of a good government to provide the means of at least a thorough elementary education to all the children under its authority. This position implies a number of particulars. It means that a high standard of qualification, both intellectual and moral, for teachers of all grades of schools, should be adopted and rigidly adhered to; that in some constitutional way a sufficient amount of funds should be provided to maintain the school, without intermission, from the beginning to the end of the year, in every ward, borough or township in the State; that all the conveniences, such as good school-houses, philosophical apparatus, and so on, should be furnished; and that a wise educational system, suited to the peculiar condition of all parts of the State, should be established and effectually carried out. Such I conceive to be one of the first duties of civil government. And the Legislatures of several of our States, in adopting and amending their common-school system from time to time, have evinced a wise regard for the best interests of their immense population, as well as a deep sense of their own obligations.

I shall now proceed to adduce some considerations to illustrate and enforce the obligations of Government to the cause of general education.

These obligations of Government are involved in the very nature and design of society. If it be the design of society to maintain an order of human life in which the highest end of humanity—not that of single individuals only, but of the

whole human family—may be actualized, it follows, unavoidably, that education, the general elevation of the masses, claims paramount attention. How can any high end be reached, if our higher nature be neglected? How can mankind be elevated and made capable of enjoying rational happiness, if the noblest attributes of their being be allowed to lie dormant or buried in ignorance? The progress of civilization does not depend upon improvement in the mechanic arts, or upon the flourishing conditions of commerce, or upon new discoveries in the science of chemistry or agriculture. However intimately these departments of social life may be connected with civilization, they do not elevate and bless the world unless education, correct morals and true religion, are generally diffused. Nay more than this; commerce may prosper, agriculture may advance and all the mechanic arts may flourish, yet in the absence of proper intellectual and moral influences, civilization may actually retrograde. Domestic peace, social virtue and happiness, as well as all the nobler enjoyments of civilized life, may be banished from society, whilst its material interests may seem to be advancing.

If society were constituted simply to protect person and property, or to secure general safety in the pursuit of business, we might limit the appropriate work of Government to material interests with some show of propriety. Or if the State originated in a concession of personal rights by individuals, by nature totally independent of each other, there might be some ground to maintain that Government has nothing to do with intellectual culture or moral elevation. Its rights and duties would be limited by the terms on which the concession had been stipulated. But such mechanical theories are unsound and false. Government is the organ of society. The governing class does not of itself constitute the State, as little as the head by itself constitutes a man. But the three great classes, namely, the *producing* class, the *governing* class and the *instructing* class, all taken together, are equally essential constituents of the State. Government is sometimes called the State, by way of emphasis, because it enacts and executes laws, main-

tains authority and order, and administers justice. But the instructing class, or the producing class, is just as truly a component part of the State as Government. And Government is the organ, not of a class, but of the whole body politic. Each class is an integral part. Each class sustains the Government. Indeed the vitalizing power of a prosperous State springs from the intelligent and virtuous portion of community. Were it becoming, therefore, to make any distinctions at all, I would say that the claims of the instructing class are primary claims, and the obligations of Government to it are not less than its obligations to the producing class, but greater. Such distinctions, however, are neither wise nor necessary. With much less propriety, consequently, can the legislative authorities make a distinction in favor of the mechanic arts, agriculture, commerce, or internal improvements, and treat the interests of education and virtue as matters of secondary importance. The design of society is not to set one man's feet on the shoulders of another, to keep one portion of mankind in ignorance and at hard labor, whilst another may revel amid the luxuries of wealth. It is not simply to dig canals and construct railroads, to erect extensive manufactories, and build large cities, to afford facilities for refined indulgence in sensuality, and increase the temptations to inactivity and indolence. But, as already stated and proved, society is that order of human life, in virtue of which, mankind, including all ranks and classes without exception, all the conditions being present, may realize the great end of their existence—in virtue of which, all the lower objects on earth, culminating in one that is eternal, may be accomplished. It is a divine order, established by inviolable laws. Government is no more than the necessary medium through which this divine order is maintained—the organ of the great body politic, whose function it is to conduct the affairs of society in such a way that all the wants of mankind, physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual, may be fully satisfied. Government has, therefore, no more right to overlook morals than to neglect commerce—no more right to be indifferent to the education of the masses than to violate the rights

of person and property—no more right to despise Christianity than to abrogate the fundamental principles of the Constitution. All interests are interwoven. All the relations of individuals and society are connected like the numerous branches of the nervous system. If Government be indifferent to common schools, colleges and universities, it is not only faithless to its trust, but foolish in the extreme. Morals and intelligence affect the main-springs of social life. They are related to the details of business and to commercial affairs in general, as the brain and the heart are related to the healthful condition of the nervous and venous systems. As well might a physician hope to restore a man to health, who is threatened with a malignant disease of the brain or heart, by applying a little salve to his fingers or toes, as Government attempt to establish general prosperity, private and public weal, by confining its attention to merely material interests. The very first conception of society or of Government, requires a far different, a far more comprehensive view of its obligations. Every able statesman, every skillful diplomatist, every true patriot, every politician who has the least claim to the cognomen, will respect the wants of the mind and the heart as of primary importance. What! Attempt to actualize the great end of society, when ignorance and wickedness, like vultures, feed on the vitals of the body politic. As well expect a racer to reach the goal when his ham-strings are cut. As well expect the eagle to ride upon the storm-cloud when his wings are dislocated. No! If Government be indifferent to moral law or general intellectual culture, the first conditions of social prosperity and happiness are repudiated.

For, it must be borne in mind that education in its whole compass affects the noblest endowments of mankind. Mind constitutes the man. Not animal nature and animal powers, not what likens the sons of God to the beasts of the field, constitute the distinctive characteristics of his being; but the indescribable powers of reason, the dominant energies of the will, the ability of that which is created in the image of God, to flap its mighty wings, rise above the limitations of the senses, re-

view the past, survey the present and penetrate the future—these endowments give to man his manliness. These distinguish him from the brute. These reveal both his sphere and his destiny.

Who, after all, are the governors of the world? Kings and Emperors? Presidents, members of Cabinet and Senators? No! The men of intellectual strength and moral worth. A little Hebrew foundling established a civil and religious polity that was perpetuated during a period of fifteen hundred years. Why? Because he obeyed God and was familiar with the whole extent of Egyptian learning. All history is full of illustrations. Who have generated the great thoughts that live in England? Such men as Shakespeare, Spencer or Milton in poetry—such as Pitt and Burke in oratory—such as Newton, Bacon, Reid and Locke in natural and moral science—such as Wellington in military affairs. Who gave impetus to an energy and enterprize, that has unfolded a national prosperity unparalleled in the history of the world? The leading minds among the colonies at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. Who have given such a fixed cast to the political mind of America, that the heterogeneous millions from foreign lands are assimilated as if by the resistless power of Alchemy? Such men as Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Henry, Adams and others. I need not multiply illustrations or proof. In Church or State, mind, educated and devout mind, will always in virtue of an inexpressible energy assert its controlling power. It is true beyond all controversy: Intellectual, moral and religious culture are the fountain from which great thoughts flow; the main-spring from which all great movements receive their impulse; the earthly foundation stones, laid by the Creator, by which the whole social fabric is bound together. These fundamental elements of social progress and national greatness, Government must respect and foster or become guilty of high treason. I repeat, therefore, that the very nature and design of society imposes on Government the obligation to guard and develop the highest endowments of mankind—to devise and promote plans by which the intellectual and moral wants of all classes of men may be properly satisfied.

It will be apposite also to reflect that *efficiency and success are intimately connected with obligation*. What the vocation of Government imposes upon it as a primary duty, the regular operation of cause and effect render essential to its prosperity and even to its existence. Commercial, financial and national prosperity depend upon the intellectual and moral character of the people. This holds true particularly of our own country, where a Government prevails that makes Americans their own servants and their own masters. To construct a rail-road, or to connect one city with another by a telegraphic wire, requires an intelligent atmosphere and public spirit, as truly as to publish a work on Geometry, Chemistry or History and give it an extensive circulation.

This branch of the subject is susceptible of extended argument and various illustration, but for want of time, I am compelled to curtail the discussion.

The distinctive feature of our Republican Government is the supremacy of *law*. Not rank, nor blood, nor wealth, rules in our free land, but law; not the decisions of human caprice, nor the arbitrary opinions of enthusiasts, nor the temporary maxims of a political party, but the eternal principles of right and wrong hold the sway in our Federal and State Constitutions. Human will is not law in America; but the divine will, as apprehended and expounded by the free understanding of Americans, in its application to the various exigencies and contingencies of social and political life. Every fundamental law has thus on the one hand the sanction of God's authority, and on the other the approval of conscience. Here lies our strength. The recognition of this principle by the people has given stability to our political institutions. The ruling mind of the nation has been sensible of its subjection to divine law and divine authority. Notwithstanding the fluctuations in commerce, notwithstanding the political agitations that have tossed and jarred the Union like a ship in a storm, yet the sense of the supremacy of law has bound our country as by a strong cable to her moorings. But so soon as ignorance and wickedness shall cut this cable, so soon as the fear of God shall be extin-

guished in the hearts of the citizens of America, the breast-work that keeps back lawlessness and rampant vice, will be broken down and the floods of destruction will sweep unchecked over the length and breadth of the land. The prevalence of Christianity gave character to all the colonies of England, Germany, the Netherlands and France, that settled along the Atlantic coast. Although hundreds of thousands have since, from year to year, sought an asylum on our shores, yet the vital energy of the original spirit, perpetuated from one decennium to another, has continued to fashion the growing nation. Would Government perpetuate our free institutions; would Government be sustained by the general mind of the people; would it maintain civil authority and justice, then must the increasing thousands of our own poor that congregate in our towns and cities, and the millions that crowd upon us from foreign countries, be educated in harmony with the genius and spirit of these United States. Government owes it as a first duty to itself, imposed even by the law of self-preservation, to promote the intellectual, moral and religious culture of the masses by all the means at its command. If the American Government would be efficient and permanent, it must seek to elevate *all* classes of society, that all may appreciate and honor divine law and social order. There is no safeguard but the intelligence and virtue of the people.

Whence come our senators, our members of Congress, our presidents and governors, all our officers from the lowest to the highest? Not from a privileged class, who have all the pecuniary resources and the military power at their command. No; we get them from the work-shop and the field; from the counting-room and the bar; from native-born Americans and naturalized Germans, Irish, Hollanders or Frenchmen; from the poor and the rich; from vile debauchees and devout Christians. All ranks and classes contribute their quota. In monarchical governments the privileged classes are highly educated. One reason is because they are called to assume the responsibility of governmental affairs. In the United States, all are privileged classes; all may ascend the steps and sit down in the

seats of political power and honor. All should, therefore, be as carefully educated as the aristocracy of England. In monarchical governments, the heirs apparent to the throne are placed under tutors and governors, and receive the most thorough training. In America, all our sons are heirs apparent, and all should receive a royal education. Government should watch over the mental and moral culture of the masses with the same assiduity that Queen Victoria directs the education of the Prince of Wales.

Again I ask, who appoint our political incumbents? Who put down one and raise up another? Who give us our legislative, executive and judicial officers? The only answer is the people. An old proverb says: Like priests, like people. We may modify it and say: Like people, like officers. If intelligence and virtue predominate among the people we may hope for an intelligent and virtuous government. And just to the extent that ignorance and vice prevail may we look for such scenes as have now and then, for the last ten years, disgraced the halls of our National Legislature and tarnished our fair fame. If Government, accordingly, desire to sustain its own dignity and honor; if it would be faithful to its own nature and mission; if it would preserve the sacredness and moral force of the constitution; if it would perpetuate the supremacy and inviolability of law; if it would keep shut the flood-gates of degrading vice, vile passions, and rampant anarchy; it is sacredly bound by every obligation, human and divine, to advance the intellectual and moral culture of all.

But I can pursue this subject no further. Throughout this discussion I have laid equal stress on *moral* and intellectual culture. These dare not be divorced. The moral nature of youth must be trained with the same patience and care as the intellect. I know of no perfect code of morals but the Bible. I know of no remedial agent, for the depravity of fallen mankind, but the religion of Christ. Education without morality and religion are of no value to Government. The brightest and most learned men of which the world has boasted, have been among the meanest and most detestable. The most intel-

lectual and refined nation of antiquity was Greece; yet it were censurable even to name, before a promiscuous assembly, the moral filth and shocking crimes that obtained among the highest classes of society. Among the most cultivated and learned nations in modern times is France; yet in point of morals, the land of Voltaire and the enthroned goddess, Reason, has the reputation of being the lowest in Christendom. Education divorced from a pure Christianity, does not, cannot, elevate. Depravity will only acquire new weapons to do its work of death. I plead, therefore, for an open Bible, without note or comment, in every common school. Let the holiest influences breathe upon the infant mind, when, like a flower, it opens its petals to receive the sunlight of life. In the name of all the noble, self-denying, iron-willed men, who laid the foundation of the federal arch, I plead for the maintenance of all the great principles that formed their exemplary characters—one of the richest legacies of the American people. In the name of the stars and stripes that float proudly on every ocean, and are the token of civil liberty and republican institutions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—in the name of the millions of blooming youth, destined for peace or war, capacitated for virtue, honor, and immortality, who will determine the internal condition of our whole nation throughout future generations, I claim as a qualification of first importance on the part of all teachers, decided faith in, and sincere reverence for, the religion of Jesus Christ.

Tiffin, O.

E. V. G.

ART. VII.—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

I. *How many Churches are there?*

According to the word of God, and the Apostles' Creed, embodied in the Heidelberg Catechism, there is only one, called the Holy Catholic Church. It was founded and established by our Lord Jesus Christ himself, in the following manner. On the day of Pentecost he poured out his Holy Spirit upon his disciples, through whose quickening and saving influences they became inspired with new life, new faith, new love, new hope; which animated them with a heaven-born zeal in the divine cause of their beloved master. Through the efficient instrumentality of these apostles, Christ extended the rich blessing of salvation to thousands of souls. Jews and Gentiles yielded to the irresistible power of God's Holy Spirit, and became living members of Christ's glorious kingdom. Thus the first congregation of Christians was established, and from this parent congregation the streams of salvation flowed out in every direction, filling the earth with gladness, and gathering into the one fold of Christ as many as shall be saved. This glorious institution of redeeming love, the Holy Catholic Church, is beautifully described by the apostle Paul, in several of his epistles. He considers the Church a spiritual, many-membered body, all animated and ruled by Christ, her divine head. He views the Church as the admirable fulness of Him, who filleth all in all; he represents her as the great tabernacle, founded and established upon the prophets and apostles, held together by Christ, the chief corner-stone, cemented with love divine, rising up to a temple of the Lord. He exhibits the Church as a great mystery of the divine union between God and fallen man, realized in and through Christ alone; she is

to him the holy, spotless congregation, acquired by the Saviour's self-sacrificing love, and purified by the washing of water;—yea, he views the Church as the pillar and foundation of truth,—as the flock of Christ, purchased with his own precious blood, watched over and fed by his servants, and ruled by his Holy Spirit. (See Eph. 2: 19–22, 4: 15–22, 5: 23–33. 1 Tim. 3: 15, 16. Acts 20: 28, &c.)

According to the apostle Paul, then, the Church is *essentially*: 1, neither a pompous, worldly minded hierarchy, nor a naked, common sense sect; but a *divine spiritual life*;—2, a life proceeding neither from Church tradition, nor from the Bible, but directly from Christ, the great and only fountain of life;—3, a life penetrating and animating all her true members;—4, a life keeping the members of the sanctified body in union and communion with Christ their glorious head, and with God the Father through the Son. As such the Christian Church must be regarded, by all friends of truth, the noblest inheritance and the most precious treasure, which in this life the parental love of our Father in Heaven has prepared for, and graciously bestowed upon his fallen, unworthy creatures. She is the paradise of heaven on earth, where poor sinners are trained for a blissful immortality in the "Father's house;" and what the hand of God has planted in her, no enemy shall ever destroy or take away. (Math. 18.) Let superstition deface her, infidelity traduce her; let thousands forsake her communion, and tens of thousands unite to break down her walls; they will only work out their own destruction, whilst the Church remains forever firm. For she is founded upon the Rock of ages, and the gates of hell even shall not prevail against her! The glory of her divine power has ever manifested itself in all her true and living members. Even in the darkest hours of bloody persecution the dying soldiers of the cross could sing: "I see the heavens open!" "Death where is thy sting!" In the bosom of the Church springs the fountain of living waters for thirsty souls. She bears the healing balm for broken hearts and contrite spirits; because with her dwells the Lamb of God, that takes away the sin of the world,

administering consolation and rest to the weary and heavy laden. Surely this glorious institution of infinite love can never perish, as long as there remains one sinner on earth, conscious of his relation to God and longing after immortality.

II. *But if there is only one true Church, why are there so many divisions, each calling itself a particular Church?*

These divisions are not the natural product of the essence and true spirit of Christianity. Like the Redeemer himself, so also his divine life, his Holy Spirit, his gospel, and all that belongs to the means of grace, are essentially *one*, and can never be divided. Nor is it in the nature of divine truth to cause separation among its real friends. On the contrary, it unites them most intimately, because the love of God, shed abroad in their hearts, causes them to be of one mind in all their higher and nobler aspirations. The element of Christian truth alone enables and persuades men to acknowledge each other as children of one common father, and as heirs of one kingdom of Heaven. Hence, we must never look for the origin of Church divisions, in the essence of Christianity itself, nor apologize for their existence upon this ground. They take their rise only after the infinite and holy life of the Saviour has come in contact with the finite and corrupt nature of man. And the principal reason is, because the finite cannot comprehend the infinite. Yet Christ and his holy gospel must be embraced by sinners, in order to effect their salvation; but sinners are like unclean and broken vessels, absolutely unable to comprehend and represent the *whole* of divine truth. Even after men have become regenerate, and their hearts are made fit temples for the living God, still their limited capacities cannot fully comprehend the entire plan of salvation. The mystery of godliness remains a mystery still. Nor do the natural peculiarities of men permit, that all should see and feel alike. Being differently constituted and related, different in feeling and views, it is utterly impossible that all should be affected alike by the power of divine truth. Neither have all men reached the same degree of actual transgression, when conviction overtakes them, and hence their sense of guilt, as well as

their appreciation of divine grace, cannot be equally deep and powerful. Whilst one sinner is quickly melted down by the tender voice of saving love, or by a silent tear of sympathy, another can be arrested only by the thunders of Sinai. And each one will afterwards cherish the truth most in that particular form in which it brought him to repentance and to Christ. It is true, Christianity is destined to work a radical change in our religious and moral principles and views; for we must be born again; old things must pass away and all things must be made new. But its transforming and renewing influence does not destroy our natural powers, our understanding, reason and will. It only inspires them with a new and heavenly life, and turns their activity into an opposite direction. The same powers, with which the apostle Paul had formerly persecuted Christ and his followers, were afterwards employed to extend the Redeemer's kingdom, and to feed the persecuted flock with heavenly manna. So it is with all truly converted persons. And then we know also, that divine truth, as a general thing, operates slowly, like a seed and like leaven. Hence it is, that there are multitudes under the influence of the Gospel, who do not possess the power thereof. Unenlightened by the Holy Spirit, and unprepared, therefore, to understand the doctrines of Christ, they are unwilling also to exercise child-like obedience to his precepts. And yet it is their birth-right to enjoy, in connection with the enlightened Christian, the means of grace in the visible Church. Under these circumstances different opinions and conflicting views are unavoidable. And when these germs of strife receive sufficient nourishment from zealous defence and stubborn opposition, they will naturally end in division. Thus we see, that Church-divisions do not spring from Christ, nor from Christianity as such; but from the great spiritual wants and imperfections of human nature. Hence, whilst we deeply deplore, and with the apostle Paul, censure and condemn divisions among Christians, because they are detrimental to their own interest, and to the cause of Christ in general; producing ill feeling, jealousy, opposition, rivalry and even hatred, and thus preying like a canker upon the ve-

ry vitals of Christian piety and virtues, we are bound, at the same time, to acknowledge that they are the natural product of fallen human nature. And as such, we may reasonably suppose, that divisions among Christians will, in all probability, continue to exist, until fallen human nature has been restored in all its individual representatives.

That this view of Church-divisions is based upon truth, may be clearly proven from the history of the past. As far back even as the age of the apostles, we find marked and deep running divisions in the Church. And whence did they originate? Some originated with *persons*, others in *particular views*, some in *customs* and others in mere *accidents*. Against this four-fold source of divisions the Holy Scriptures contain many solemn warnings, 1 Cor. 1:12; 3:4-7, &c. In the *one* congregation at Corinth, no less than four parties existed, standing apparently in hostile opposition to each other, 1 Cor. 3. Three of these parties were firmly attached to the person and ministration of one or the other servant of God, that had labored among them. This fact proves, that even the apostles, and their immediate successors, differed in talent and ability, and that this awakened differences of opinion, and occasioned even opposition among their own beloved hearers. Nor can it be doubted for a moment, that Paul, Apollos and Cephas, in their ministrations to the people, all drew from the same fountain of wisdom and knowledge, of consolation and divine grace, namely from Christ their common master. They were also equally honest and zealous in their labors of love. But then every one of these great teachers proceeded in his own peculiar way of thought and delivery, which made different impressions upon the hearers. Hence, preferences for the personality of each one arose among the congregation, according to temperament, capacity and taste. Thus the congregation became divided, and Christians of different names was the result.

From the apostolic Church we learn also, that particular views and customs have exerted a powerful influence in producing and propagating divisions. The doctrine of free grace, as preached by the apostle Paul among the heathen and his

converts, did not please the Jewish Christians, living under the ministration of the apostle Peter; and the slavish adherence of the latter to the Old Testament laws and customs, found no favor with the former. A wide difference in feeling, opinion and views existed, which led subsequently to many grievous divisions. This process has repeated itself in the Church from time to time, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter.

III. *But could the followers of Christ not have prevented these divisions in the Church?*

From the age of the apostles down to the present, true Christians have always been deeply sensible, that it was their duty to do so; and every real friend of the Redeemer's kingdom must feel so. With the Holy Scriptures before them, as the only ultimate rule of faith and practice, all true Christians must be conscious of the great evil of Church-divisions. For in them we hear the Saviour fervently pray, "*That all may be one as He and the Father are one.*" All the inspired, holy writers exhort constantly to brotherly love, unity of mind and action, and the apostle Paul earnestly rebukes Christians for causing and perpetuating divisions. In view of this, the followers of Christ have, from the beginning, prayed and labored that every existing division might be annihilated, and the household of faith be kept in union and harmony.

The primitive Church looked with holy indignation upon every false teacher, who endeavored, by the spread of erroneous doctrines, to undermine the foundations of her faith. She entered boldly into battle against one heresy after another, as they sprang up in rapid succession, because they alienated her members by causing opposition and strife, and thus destroyed her peace and prosperity. In this spiritual warfare, the Church employed Gospel truth as the mighty weapon against her enemies, and she gained the victory over them all, because the great Captain of her salvation directed. By these repeated and ever increasing attacks upon her essential doctrines, the Church was compelled to strengthen and fortify her union, in order to become established more firmly as the empire of divine truth, as the guardian and defender of the holy religion

of Jesus Christ. The inherent principle of self-preservation on the one hand, and opposing powers in the form of heathenism and heresies on the other, forced the Church to aspire after uniformity in doctrine, worship and government. For this purpose she convened in councils to settle her doctrines, and to mature and adopt such plans and means, as would accomplish this desirable end. In this noble aspiration after unity in faith and practice, the primitive Church held fast to all that had been handed down to her from the age of the apostles. As yet she could in no wise be considered a "kingdom of this world;" for she had thus far kept the simplicity of her doctrines, and carefully preserved the purity of her faith and morals. Although a tendency to excess and corruption manifested itself in various directions, yet, in all *essential* points, the Church remained unchanged till the fourth century. For, up to this time, she had formed no alliance with the State; but existed as an entirely separate institution, and was exclusively under the control of her Bishops, as a governing body. No compulsory measures were employed in the pursuit of her holy objects. She was Christ-like in poverty and lowliness; therefore she was also despised. All who joined her communion, had to expect no temporal reward, but bloody persecution, which broke in upon her, from time to time, with purifying power. So far then the Church had indeed been successful in establishing unity among her members, and she stood now as one united body over against all her enemies. But her work was not yet finished. The excommunication of heretics, and the suppression of their doctrines, had not annihilated them. They made their re-appearance subsequently, and caused the Church much trouble. Besides, those bloody persecutions very naturally called forth in the Church a longing desire after greatness and power, in order that she might defend herself against the enemies of God, and save her own beloved children from a cruel death.

This desire on the part of the Church was realized in the fourth century, when she formed an alliance with the Roman Empire under the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the

Great. Now she was made a national Church, great and powerful indeed; but for this external grandeur she had to sacrifice her internal purity. For the whole life and character of the Church experienced a mighty change. The fulness of the Holy Spirit, so copiously poured out in the beginning upon all her members, was now fast departing. And this prepared the way for that worldly spirit which ruled subsequently in the Church to such a fearful extent. The example of Christ, in humility, meekness, long suffering and forbearance, was gradually lost sight of; because her attention was drawn away more and more from the internal, essential, and fixed upon the external, accidental. New forms of every kind made their appearance, of which the previous age was comparatively ignorant. Settled down in these ancient forms, the oriental, or Greek Church has remained stationary till the present day. But the Roman Church was destined to progress. From a cöordinate position to the State, she elevated herself gradually above it, and with the rapid extension of her borders she increased her lofty power. Thus the Church had realized her desire; for she was now beyond the reach of all persecuting enemies, and no heresy could harm her. But also this superiority did not give entire satisfaction, because it left room still for internal divisions among her own members. In order to remove this difficulty, it was necessary that her power and authority should find a common centre, and hence she abandoned the Patriarchal government, and invested the Bishop of Rome with the entire management of the Church. Thus the Papacy was instituted in the year 590. Strange as this result may appear, it was but the natural product of the original twofold desire of the Church: 1st, to keep down heresies and divisions, and 2nd, to save her members from the persecuting spirit of heathenism. Not a few individuals, therefore, but the entire Church, urged by a sense of duty from within, and forced by existing circumstances from without, established the Papacy. But why at Rome? Because Rome had, for centuries back, enjoyed the confidence of many nations, who considered her the very first among cities. She was said to have been blessed with the la-

bors of the apostle Peter, and dedicated through his blood to a supremacy in the Church. This story added much to her importance; it filled the people with reverence, and imbued the successors of Peter with great confidence in their assumed prerogatives. Circumstances favoring, the Bishop of Rome rendered himself independent of the Emperor, and now not only the city, but also the surrounding country, became dependent upon him for protection. In this way he united in himself gradually the powers of Church and State, and in this union of a twofold power, we see the fundamental features of the whole hierarchy.

But the development of the Church in external power and greatness was not yet complete. The increase of success augmented her ambition. To establish herself as a theocracy became now the leading desire, and she endeavored by all possible means to become elevated far above all kingdoms of this world. With this object in view, the first Pope, Gregory the Great, labored zealously to embellish the Church in all its parts. For this purpose, he not only made use of the arts; but introduced also many customs and decorations from heathenism. His main object seems to have been, to exhibit Christianity in as grand and imposing a form as possible, and thus to captivate the senses and charm the imagination. In his devotion to the Church he was, doubtless, sincere; for there was no sacrifice too great for him, to be made for the promotion of her prosperity. The Church in return appreciated his labors of love; gladly received his counsel, and followed his direction cheerfully. In his lofty position he exercised Christian humility; declined the title of *universal Bishop*, (*Papa universalis*), preferring to be called *the servant of the servants of God*. (*Servus servorum Dei*.) But to preserve the unity, power and influence of the Church, he resisted, with firm determination, every Bishop who attempted to raise himself to an equality with himself. Prompted by Christian love and sympathy, he sent as many devoted missionaries among the benighted heathen as circumstances would admit; and their efforts were crowned with abundant success. Great Britain, and the northern

parts of Germany, are indebted to the first Pope for the firm establishment of Christianity in their midst. For all efforts to convert those barbarous nations, previously made by missionaries who acted independent of Rome, had succeeded only partially, and the Gospel light once spread among them, had been suppressed again by the ruling power of darkness. This great success inspired the Church with confidence in the lately established Papacy. Her long cherished desire after union was at length realized, and she felt convinced of the fact, that "*in union there is strength.*" Historians have told us, that the Papacy was an improvement upon the age immediately preceding it. This is undoubtedly true; but it should be borne in mind, that this improvement did not proceed from the Papacy as such. It was because the first Pope was a Christian man, who used the papal power for the good of Christ's Kingdom. *He* brought about this improvement, and the Papacy was only an instrument in his hands; just as much so as subsequently it became an instrument for evil in the hands of wicked Popes. Had the first Pope been like most of his successors, the Papacy would have been a curse to mankind from the very start; and, on the other hand, we may presume, if all his successors had been like him, the Papacy might probably have been a blessing to the world from beginning to end. But they have proved to be very unlike him. Whilst the first Pope has been canonized as a Saint, *not a single one* among the large number of his successors has been found worthy of that honorable distinction.

The Papacy being established, the Church became now an asylum for the oppressed. One prince after another, pressed by the force of circumstances in times of war, applied to her for relief and protection, and she complied with the request, on condition of baptism and peaceful submission to her authority. In this way the Church came into the possession of lands and riches, every addition of which augmented her power and stimulated her desire for more, until finally she had the whole civilized world under her control.

But it was impossible for the Church to digest and assimilate

such an abundance of rude material, without serious injury to herself, especially since her spiritual life was already in a state of decline. With the introduction of heathen customs, the first Pope had unintentionally laid the foundation for future abuses, which began to manifest themselves soon after his departure. Those beautiful forms and ceremonies, invented by him, lost their life gradually, and the pernicious influence of a corrupt world, generated moral disease, which by degrees penetrated the entire body of the Church. Truly abominable characters often occupied the Papal chair, in whose wicked hands the two-fold power of Church and State was shamefully abused. Then again, the highest office in the Church was arbitrarily bestowed upon children of twelve, ten, eight and even of six years. How unnatural and preposterous, that a mere child should be made the vicegerent of Christ. This shows, however, the lamentable condition, into which the Church had sunk. Love of gain had become a ruling passion, and, to satisfy this, she went even so far as to sanction the use of bloody weapons to force the poor heathen into submission.

Possessed of the keys of heaven, the Papacy arrogated the entire power of salvation to herself; claimed infallibility in the face of all changes, mistakes and contradictions;—began to sell indulgences for money—and for money she pretended to raise the poor wretch out of the burning torments of Purgatory. Having her doctrines clearly defined and firmly established, she now considered herself as the all-sufficient store-house of divine grace. Therefore, the written word of God, in the form of the Holy Bible, became not only superfluous, but actually dangerous, especially in the hands of the unlearned. Hence, several of the Popes actually forbade the free circulation of that sacred volume; and hence tradition became the principal rule of faith and practice. Under such deplorable circumstances, what else could be expected than that pure and undefiled religion must decline! Mental stagnation and spiritual despotism must increase rapidly! And, as a natural consequence, vice and immorality must finally gain free course throughout the Church. That such was really the case, the united voice

of historical facts loudly proclaims, and the great Church-reformation proves it beyond a doubt.

We see then, that the Church, from the beginning, was conscious of her duty, to put down heresies and prevent divisions; that for this purpose she formed an alliance with the State and assumed her government and power; that this aspiration after unity led to the establishment of the Papacy;—that the first Pope was a good, Christian man, in whose hands the new institution prospered;—that subsequently the Church degenerated and became actually corrupt.

IV. *But did the Church succeed in suppressing heresies and divisions?*

We find in the New Testament, that the apostles concentrated all their power of divine truth against two hostile elements: Judaism and Heathenism; because these elements exercised a pernicious influence at that early stage, and contained also the germs of many grave errors and soul-destroying heresies. Although their arduous labor in this direction, was not in vain, yet we find, that, toward the close of the apostolic age, at least one of those elements had grown much stronger and bolder. For John, the last of the disciples, speaks of such in his epistles, as deny that Christ has come into the flesh, and he calls them Antichrists. Soon after the departure of the apostles, the two fundamental heresies, Ebionitism and Gnosticism, having been developed gradually from the above named elements, manifested their pernicious character and influence in the primitive Church. The former denied the divine nature of Christ, and the latter his human nature. Various other errors originated from the same source, all of which found their firm and zealous opponents in the Church Fathers. But also these servants of the Lord, although successful in their warfare, could not annihilate the deep rooted and far spreading power of those heresies. Arianism in the fourth, and Pelagianism in the fifth century, were but the natural growth from them. And they have thus reproduced themselves under various forms, from time to time, even till the present day. The Church was successful only so far, that she detected and prov-

ed those heresies to be the work of darkness, and as such, cast them out from her bosom. And all this she accomplished by no other means than the power of divine truth. But after the establishment of Popery, the most barbarous and hellish means were employed, to make men submit to her authority. Not only heresies, but necessary reforms also, and salutary changes, were cruelly suppressed. And yet we find, that sects, and distinctions, and orders, and divisions, and heresies, and opposition, and party strife, all existed in the Church throughout her history. The hierarchy, with all its politics, and spies, and executions, and horrible machines of torture and death, was not a sufficient safe-guard against the rise and progress of differences, disputes and divisions among her own members. An institution may chain down the human body, but no power on earth is able to keep in perpetual bondage the human soul!

V. *If the Papal Church degenerated, however, and became actually corrupt, must we still consider her a Christian Church?*

Most assuredly! because Christ declared solemnly, that he would build his Church upon an immovable rock; even the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. His precious promise, never to forsake the Church, must be, and has been, verified in all times. Though even prophets may imagine that *all* has been swallowed up by idolatry; yet the Lord points out seven thousand, who have not bent their knee to Baal. Casting a superficial glance at the Church during the "middle ages," it would seem, indeed, as if for centuries nothing but impenetrable darkness had reigned throughout her borders. But when we stand still and listen attentively, we hear the deep under-tones of true Christian piety. The same spirit that had animated the apostles, was still in the Church, and operated powerfully, though not so generally. The life of the ever-present Saviour was still there, and divine truth, though obscured, could never be entirely suppressed. The abuses and corruptions were, to a great extent, the legitimate product of seeds sown in the primitive Church; not by Christ or his apostles, but by their successors. In essence and spirit Christian-

ity retained its divine character, even in the midst of human degradation. Like some mighty river, whose bed is lost beneath the surface of the earth, whilst in reality the same quantity of water glides through its invisible channel ; so also the life of our Redeemer, with its streams of salvation, flowed along uninterruptedly, beneath the external rubbish of the Papal Church. Its presence and power manifested itself continually in various ways. The voice of Reformers was heard in various directions, and many earnest attempts were made, from time to time, to free the Church from existing abuses ; to give free course to the influence of divine truth, and to set the captive soul of man at liberty. The struggle was hard and long ; because the spirit of the world had riveted the chains of bondage so firmly, that without divine assistance of a special character, this bondage could not be cast off. But God, in his wise Providence, raised up men in due season, who, like Moses of old, should lead the captives into a land of promise ; the land of gospel freedom. This took place in the days of the great Church-Reformation, in the sixteenth century. The true life of Christianity, purified by the streams of gospel truth, rushed forth again, like a subterranean river, from under the gigantic abominations of a corrupted Papacy !

THE REFORMATION.

Its cause—origin and instruments—separation from the old Church—justification—division.

1. What caused the Reformation ?

The extreme abuses of Popery excited great and powerful dissatisfaction in the old Church, which at first confined to single individuals and congregations, spread rapidly at last, and called forth a mighty reaction. Voices of earnest warning had often been heard in the bosom of the Church ; but she heeded them not. On the contrary, she persisted in her downward course. Pious watchmen upon her broken walls, who performed their sacred duty faithfully, in sounding the trumpet of alarm, were cruelly burned to death ; because she did not want to be disturbed in her sinful tranquility and repose. At times

she could not resist the conviction of guilt, and was forced to acknowledge the absolute necessity of a reform. Pope Julius II, was required by the cardinals to promise, and swear solemnly, that within two years he would call together a council for the reformation of the Church. But the Papacy had lost the moral courage to undertake the work herself, and felt convinced also that a radical reformation must prove her own destruction. Hence she offered no consolation to the anxious longing for deliverance, which became more general from year to year. But whilst the Papacy refused and resisted, the Spirit of God continued his work of enlightening among the people. This wretched, helpless state of the Papacy, and the growing consciousness of the people, in regard to their spiritual wants, on the one hand, and the awakening and animating influence of the Holy Spirit on the other, must be considered the twofold cause of the Reformation. The Lord's people were in bondage; they felt their oppression, and he brought them deliverance.

2. But how did the Reformation originate?

The wide-spread and deep-rooted dissatisfaction of the people in the sixteenth century, culminated in a few individuals: *Luther, Zwingli and Calvin*. God, in his wise Providence, had prepared them to discover the truth as it is in Christ; and with this heavenly torch they examined into the nature and condition of the Church. By degrees the great evils of Popery, its disgusting diseases, its ever increasing imposition and oppression became apparent to them, and they felt convinced that the removal of these evils required a radical reformation. Influenced by the Spirit of God, and animated with zeal for the cause of Christ, these men came forward boldly, giving utterance to the crying wants of the people, and exposing fearlessly the shameful abuses and intolerable errors of the Papacy. Thus the great work of the Reformation commenced, not beyond the Church, but in her own bosom, and the chosen instruments, through whom it was to be accomplished, were some of her own legitimate sons.

It is remarkable that the Reformation commenced simulta-

neously in three different parts of the old country ; in Germany, Switzerland and France, whilst the Reformers themselves were ignorant of each other. It is very common among Lutherans to claim priority in this respect, namely, that the Lutheran Church is older than the Reformed ; but this is a mistake. In 1506, Zwingli commenced already to preach the pure Gospel. "*We have no right,*" he said at that time, "*to twist and construe the sense of Scripture according to our own pleasure,*" referring to the doctrines of the Church. "*We must seek the thoughts of God in his own word.*" And in 1516, his solemn declaration "*Christ is our only treasure,*" was working among the great mass of the people like a leaven, and had wrought already a wonderful change. The great success, attendant upon the labors of the Reformers, is an overwhelming proof of the extensive and painful dissatisfaction with the old system. No sooner had they raised the standard of truth, than hundreds and thousands flocked around them ; all eager to drink in knowledge from the pure fountain, and ready to join in a conflict with the powers of darkness. The eruption was at once unexpected and mighty ; it shook the hierarchy to its centre and made the Pope tremble on his throne. But he and his allies, having so long closed their eyes against the crying wants of the people, now stopped their ears against the mighty voice of truth, and would not listen, though it spoke in tones of thunder ! Instead of yielding, they resisted, and arrayed themselves in hostile opposition to the good cause. They were smitten with blindness, like Pharaoh, in order to arouse the people of God more fully to complete their deliverance. It made the Reformers feel indignant, and incited them to redoubled activity in their divine mission.

3. The Reformers did not act the part of bigoted fanatics, or selfish, overbearing sectarians ; which is a noble trait in their character. They were not actuated by a spirit of indifference to the existing institutions of the Church ; nor did they at once tear themselves loose from her communion, like many would-be reformers of later date. They began, not with breaking down, but to reform and build up by the faithful preaching of

positive truth. Opposition and protestation on their part, began only when the merits of the Redeemer were offered for sale by reckless priests; and after the Pope had excommunicated and hurled his anathemas against them. And where is there an awakened soul in all Christianity, that could look with silence upon such monstrous abominations! Gladly would the Reformers have remained in the old Church, if she had only permitted them to preach the gospel to her children in its original purity. The unity of the Church was dear to their hearts. Even the Papacy itself was long held in deep reverence by them; only its corruptions they could not tolerate. And to save the old system from utter desolation, it was absolutely necessary to disclose the mantle of sanctified hypocrisy, and lay bare its accumulated unrighteousness. Light will naturally dispel the shades of darkness, and bring concealed objects into view. The Lord in his wise Providence, had raised up the Reformers to be great and shining lights; they understood their calling and performed their sacred duty faithfully. We rejoice in their heroism and feel grateful for their noble deeds. Through their instrumentality, the Father of light caused the sun of righteousness to cast his life-giving rays again freely into every oppressed soul that longed for deliverance.

4. But, notwithstanding all this, the question has been raised: Whether the Reformation can be justified? The Papal Church, as is well known, always has and ever will, condemn the whole movement as wrong and diabolical, as long as she holds on to her doctrine of the Church; and this she can never give up without causing the whole institution to crumble to pieces. But even Protestants have been troubled with this question, and not a few have abandoned the cause of Protestantism in despair. Perhaps they directed their attention more to the external organism of the Church, to her wonderful system and admirable uniformity, than to the essence and spirit of Christianity; or a sickly scrupulosity about the apparent distracted condition of the Protestant Church; or both these reasons together, may have caused them to embrace Catholi-

cism. We do, however, not see any reason for doubt on this subject. For the principle of reform is deeply lodged in the soul of man. The voice of conscience, in conformity with the teachings of Scripture, whispers distinctly, "you must repent and reform your life," whenever a person has gone astray. And this is the case with both saints and sinners, as long as they are exposed to the influences of a sinful world, and subject to the weaknesses of human nature. We all stand in need continually, of reformation in thought, word and action. The mother teaches this to her disobedient child; the wife to her faithless husband; the sister to her erring brother, and one friend to another, all the world over. And what is necessary for individuals, can never be dispensed with in society, nor in the visible Church. History proves this beyond a doubt. From the age of the apostles down to the present day, a single congregation, as well as the whole Church, has always been liable to fall into error and commit grievous mistakes. And whenever this has been the case, a reformation was necessary. But never was there a period in all the annals of history, when a *radical* reformation had become so absolutely necessary, as in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Whoever refuses to acknowledge this, must wilfully close his eyes against overwhelming facts! No honest Christian, whether Catholic or Protestant, having made himself acquainted with the state of the Church at that time, will for a moment doubt the absolute necessity and justice of the great Church Reformation. And because the Roman Church refused to commence the great work, therefore it devolved upon a few individuals, who were qualified for the task, such men as we fully know the Reformers to have been. This is nothing singular! When Israel sighed and trembled beneath the yoke of Egyptian bondage, God did not leave it to his people *in general* to deliver themselves; but he raised up his servant Moses to set them free again. Also from the Babylonian captivity they were rescued through the instrumentality of single prophets. The allwise Ruler of the universe has always accomplished great wonders and miracles by small and insignificant means. In this won-

der-working God our confidence is firm, and hence his great work of Reformation in the sixteenth century stands in need of no vindication. That many things of an objectionable character attached to the Reformation, was acknowledged by the Reformers themselves, who endeavored, with all their might, to prevent and remove them. Romanists may, therefore, consider those great men selfish, proud, haughty and fanatical, as in their blind zeal they always have done. They may cast odium upon them and their followers; may brand them as heretics and consign the whole Protestant Church to perdition; what need we care? "Is God for us, who can be against us?"

Well might we tremble before the terrible anathemas of the Papacy, if her doctrine of the Church were true; if she had the exclusive possession of the keys of heaven; if the Holy Spirit could be confined within the wall of a worldly-minded hierarchy; if she really were the all-sufficient store-house of divine grace, and had the power to bestow that grace according to her own pleasure. Well might we tremble, if she indeed possessed the power to save the living and to rescue even the dead; all of which she claims and professes to do. But is it not evident, that in this the Papal Church has assumed the place, office and power of Christ? Nothing but blind presumption could have led her to exercise such transcending arrogance! Therefore the Lord has humbled her. But for us it is sufficient to know that Christ, when he commissioned Peter and his other disciples, giving them the use of the keys of heaven, *he did not give the entire work of salvation into their hands, in order that he might withdraw and thenceforth look on as an idle spectator!* We are assured of his unceasing activity, on earth as well as in heaven. We feel convinced that Christ alone is the good shepherd, and the only proper door into the communion with God! He alone can speak, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," and has power over the living and the dead! We know too that the kingdom of God does not consist in eating and drinking; not in outward pomp and splendor, in grand temples and imposing ceremonies; "*but in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.*" This is what we de-

sire, and thanks be to God ! that Protestants realize the presence of Christ, and are able to rejoice in his righteousness, through the witnessing power of his Holy Spirit ! We hear the tender voice of the "*good shepherd*," and he feeds our immortal souls upon the green pastures of gospel truth. Let Rome, therefore, send forth her denunciations against us ; we exult and triumph : Papacy where is thy authority ! Hierarchy where is thy terror !

H. R.

[To be continued.]

ART. VIII.—SHORT NOTICES.

ELEMENTS OF THE ART OF RHETORIC: ADAPTED FOR USE IN COLLEGES AND ACADEMIES, AND FOR THE PRIVATE STUDY. By Prof. Henry N. Day. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1853. 1 vol. pp. 305.

A book that has met with general favor wherever known, and passed through several large editions already, does not need very much additional commendation to extend still further its circulation. The mere fact, however, that a book on any department of the sciences meets with ready sale, is not of itself unquestionable proof that it is just the one needed to satisfy the demand in that particular direction. But it seems to be evidence that there is a want which it is sought to have supplied. That there did exist such a want in the department presided over by Professor Day is not at all denied. The work, generally considered the best, heretofore, in the department of Rhetoric was that of Archbishop Whately, now in common use. Yet all who have there attempted to study the principles of this most excellent art, will be free to acknowledge that for lack of interest in the book, it was, next to his *Logic*, more or less repulsive.

This common defect is attempted to be remedied in the plan of this treatise by Prof. Day. He rejects the more modern methods of writing books on Rhetoric, and falls back to the plan of the early authors who treated of this art. The great difference between the later English writers and the ancient masters, such as Quintilian, Cicero, &c., is found in the general division of Rhetoric called *Invention*. While this was esteemed of great account by those classic authors, it is al-

most entirely crowded out, or at most but meagerly treated of in later works.

Accordingly, our author makes the two general divisions, Invention and Style—as the art includes “both the supply of thought and of language.” To the first of these divisions, Invention, he assigns the place of primary importance. This is one of the main characteristic differences in which he improves on other works in this department. Besides, it aims at being philosophical, so far as the nature of the art will allow. And above all it is practical; and the author’s experience, as a teacher of Rhetoric, of course serves an important purpose in turning this text-book to the highest profitable account.

A fault too common in modern text-books on the art of Rhetoric, is to treat almost exclusively of Style, and neglect the more important part which necessarily conditions the style. In his treatise Prof. Day develops the organic relation of form and contents. Thought and expression hold a necessary relation in discourse. But this is too often overlooked. There is such a thing as reducing this art, when the division embracing style is alone attended to, as in some text-books it is, to a mere smooth jingle of words. As the form of expression, or “the dress of language” does not make up for the meagerness of thought; so “the one may be rich and gorgeous, while the other is miserably lean and dry.” The author truly says, that invention depends on “the richness of the thought itself which constitutes the theme, not on the garb it may chance to wear.” To the beginner in the art of composing, the task is not so repulsive and repugnant to the feelings, because he is ignorant of words and their use, but because he is barren in thought. And no amount of labor in marshaling a fine array of words, will compensate for the absence of thought.

Invention calls for the active exercise of the mental powers, and thus engages the interest of the learner. From this the author concludes that, “It is next to impossible to awaken a hearty interest in mere style, independent of thought; as the futile attempts to teach the art of composition, as a mere thing of verbal expression, have proved. Composing, when thus taught, must necessarily be regarded as a drudgery and be shunned instinctively with strong aversion. It is otherwise, when thought is the main thing regarded. There is to every mind a pure and elevated pleasure in inventing. * * * It cannot be questioned that it is to the exclusion of invention from our systems of Rhetoric that the neglect into which the art has fallen, is chiefly to be ascribed.” These sentiments, indicating in some measure the spirit and plan of this book, must commend themselves to

those interested in this branch of study. The work will be found to embody a considerable amount of solid sense, along with its share of philosophical treatment.

We cheerfully bespeak for this book an impartial examination; with the conviction, that as a text-book in Colleges and High Schools, or for private study, it will at least partially, supply a great want.

R.

THE TEACHER AND THE PARENT: A TREATISE UPON COMMON SCHOOL EDUCATION. *By Charles Northend, A. M. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1853. 1 vol. pp. 327.*

THE science of teaching is second in importance to but few, in a practical way, of which we have any knowledge. Teaching may very properly now be ranked as one of the learned professions. The golden age of quackery in this, as well as in the other professions of law, and medicine, and theology, is fast, we hope, drawing to a close. It is a somewhat consoling reflection to the Christian and true philanthropist, that in this progressive age of ours, some of the more important interests of our race are not altogether overlooked. Among the rest education is claiming due attention.

In the rapid increase of Schools and Academies of a higher grade, and Colleges (of a lower grade,) a large and constant draft is made upon the active talent of our country, to fill these many new-made places with professors, and principals and teachers. Candidates for these important posts must be prepared by some means or other, if they are not to fail entirely in their new undertakings. Some have felt this want: and provision has, therefore, been made, by which this desideratum may be supplied. We may then welcome anything that helps, even in the most practical sense, to fit the applicants for the responsible places they are to fill.

Though we have been charged with having no particular fondness for any style of Puritanism, yet we must say, that even a good Puritan is not without interest to us. The book now under notice, is a good specimen of this spirit embodied, and bears evidence of the true Yankee genius. We like the book, and consider it one of the best of its kind. It cannot but be of invaluable account to the young teacher. Even older and more experienced ones may be no little benefited by it. Indeed, we cannot but think, that had such a book been in the hands of teachers of "the olden times," their influence on their pupils, and through them, on our generation, would have been of a vastly different character, from what it really has been found to be.

The contents of the book, from the nature of the case, are pre-eminently practical. The range of subjects considered, is various and comprehensive. Judging from the many quotation marks found in the book, one might suppose that the author has not much to claim in the way of originality. But in many instances of such quotations made, we have reason to believe that nothing has been lost by us, from the fact that such space is covered by these choice selections and not rather by matter taken from the author's own store. And, moreover, we remember also, that the best specimens of originality are not always found in those books where quotation marks are the fewest.

The book is commended to the special attention of the teaching profession generally.

R.

DAVIES' BOURDON'S ALGEBRA: REVISED EDITION. *New York.*
A. S. Barnes & Co., 1853.

THE Publishers have issued a fine revised edition of this excellent work on Algebra. Of the merits of this treatise on this particular branch of Mathematics it is needless to speak. Although it is only an abridgement based upon the original work of M. Bourdon, which is a full and scientific treatise, yet, as here presented by Dr. Davies, it is as full and complete as the time usually allotted to this branch of study will allow. It is now the text-book in many of our American Colleges and Academies. In our own Colleges, eastern, western and, we believe, southern also, it has been introduced. Many will be glad to meet their old friend in new dress and neat and improved appearance. The publishers deserve our thanks, which they will please accept.

R.

1. THE NEW AMERICAN SPEAKER: *A collection of Oratorical and Dramatical pieces, Soliloquies and Dialogues, with an Original Introductory Essay on the Elements of Elocution. Designed for the use of Schools, Academies, and Colleges. By J. C. Zachos, A. M. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.*
2. A NEW TREATISE ON ASTRONOMY AND THE USE OF THE GLOBE; IN TWO PARTS. *Designed for the use of High Schools and Academies. By Prof. James McIntire, M. D. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.*
3. INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCES: PRESENTING A SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF NATURE. *Designed for Schools and Academies. Edit-*

ed by D. M. Reese, A. M., M. D. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

4. THE ORTHOEPIST. By James H. Martin. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

5. INTRODUCTORY LESSONS IN READING AND ELOCUTION: IN TWO PARTS. By R. G. Parker and J. C. Zachos. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

THE above works belong to the National Series of School Books, published by the Messrs. Barnes and Co., of New York. Our time and space require us to notice these excellent books in a group, instead of separately and in detail as we could wish. The attention of that part of the public, most interested in the department to which they belong, is called to them in this general way. The series has already been introduced into many of the best Schools and Academies, and where the books have been tried and examined thoroughly, a satisfactory report has been given in their favor. There are yet many places, however, where these books might, with great profit all around, be made to take the place of inadequate and poorly arranged text books.

Public attention is waking up to the importance of providing for schools proper implements in the way of text-books. The time was, when it mattered very little, what kind of a book was put into the hands of a child. Almost every pupil in the school had a different kind of a book from all others. The teacher had to do the best he could, but there were no classes then. We remember very well the book our grandfather put into our hands when first we had to bring a "reading book" to school. It might as well have been the Koran, or Blackstone, or De Bello Gallico, for all we were benefitted by it. Sanscrit, or Hebrew, or Choctaw, would have been nearly as intelligible. And then, how all the boys and even the teacher, too, laughed at our book! But those times are past, and now a better day for schools and school boys, has taken their place.

We had designed to make special reference, if possible, to the full and complete Speaker; to the invaluable Companion, that every man should have acquaintance with; to the Orthoepist, and to the merits of the other books above named, severally, as they deserve. But teachers and parents and others concerned in this matter, may be left to form their own opinions, now that their attention has been called to the National Series.

R.

THE LIFE AND LABORS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. *Translated from the German of Dr. Philip Schaff, Professor of Theology at Mercersburg, Pa., by the Rev. T. C. Porter.* New York: J. C. Riker, 1854. pp. 150. 12mo.

THE LIFE OF ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY, DUCHESS OF THURINGIA, *by the Count De Montalembert, Peer of France. Translated by Mary Hackett.* New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., pp. 427. 12mo.
For sale by Shryock, Reed, & Co., Chambersburg.

THE first of these volumes is likely to recommend itself to the favorable attention of many at this time, from the high reputation its author is coming to have with the public generally by his *History of the Apostolic Church*. It is characterized by the same happy qualities of method and style, which appear to so much advantage in that truly masterly performance; and breathes throughout the same fresh and generous spirit. The translator also has done his part well. The work is every way fitted to become popular; and it is for popular use more particularly that it professes to be published. "It is not offered to the public," the translator tells us, "as a complete monograph; it is designed for the general reader rather than the scholar—to give a condensed picture of the life and labors of that eminent saint, who alone, of all the ancient Fathers, stood high in favor with the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, and exerted a mighty influence over them, as well as over the preceding generations."

Montalembert's *Life of St. Elizabeth* is in every way an interesting and beautiful work. It comes to us from the pen of one, who is justly admired as a statesman and scholar throughout the civilized world. Its subject is invested with a religious significance, not often surpassed in the lives of the saints. It serves at the same time to shed much light on the character of the period to which it belongs, the beginning of the thirteenth century, that age of disorder and darkness, in many respects, which was yet so eminently again the age of faith and heroic consecration to the service of Christ and his Church. In this view the work has a much wider aim than that of a mere isolated sketch of Christian biography. It is so constructed as to be in fact a most important contribution to the general history of the period to which St. Elizabeth of Hungary belongs. For this purpose, the distinguished author has prefixed to the *Life of the Saint*, an admirable Introduction, presenting a graphic and comprehensive picture of the Christian world during the half century preceding her time. "It has been felt," he tells us, "that even the purely profane history of

an age, so important for the destinies of mankind, might gain much in depth, and in accuracy, from particular researches on the object of the most fervent faith and dearest affections of the men of those times. We may venture to say, that in the history of the middle ages, there are few biographies so well adapted to carry out that view, as the history of St. Elizabeth." So on the other hand, a sketch of her age is required to make intelligible this particular history itself. "Not only is it that her destiny, her family and her name, are connected more or less with a host of the events of those times, but that her character is so analogous to what the world then saw on a grander scale, that it becomes indispensably necessary for the reader to recall, as he goes along, the principal features of the social state wherein her name holds such a distinguished place." To its theme, thus happily chosen and broadly apprehended, the literary execution of the work may be said to do full justice. It is written in a strain of active sympathy with the spirit of the life it describes, and breathes throughout a tone of believing and loving enthusiasm in its favor, which tells with happy effect on the form and style of the whole book. It is beautiful, considered simply as a work of art. "There is a winning charm," as the Preface to the Translation says, "a soft, poetic halo, around the whole narrative, that is in admirable keeping with the life and character of the charming princess, whose brief mortal career it chronicles;" and altogether, "it is a work of such rare merit, in its kind, that wherever it goes it will be sure to make friends and admirers for itself, and requires not a word of commendation." N.

AN INDEX TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. *By Wm. Fred. Poole,*

A. M., Librarian of the Boston Mercantile Library Association.

New York: Charles B. Norton, Publisher. 1853. 8 vo. pp. 521.

Few things could impress the mind more fully with the richness, extent and variety of the Periodical Literature of the present day than such a book as this. It concentrates, as it were, within the angle of vision, a wide and variegated field, teeming with the products of one of the most intellectually active periods the world has ever seen. Periodical Literature is indeed one of the great facts of the age; and though as a laboratory of thought and a store-house of knowledge, it is open to criticism on the score of necessitating crudeness and superficiality, yet we think these drawbacks are more than counterbalanced by its advantages, especially in the way of reaching the masses of the people; and at all events, whatever may be said for or against it, it is undoubtedly the great channel through which the age

is putting forth its mental activity. No where else are the great questions of the day more earnestly discussed, or its great problems pushed nearer to solution. No other single agency commands such a galaxy of talent. The list of contributors to the Reviews and other Periodicals of England and this country, comprises almost every name of distinguished eminence in literature, theology or science. In view of these facts the compilation of a work like that before us was truly a public good, and was most urgently demanded. It was a Herculean task. Nothing could have accomplished it, with anything like accuracy, but the most indefatigable perseverance. It is purely an Index, alphabetically arranged, of the subjects treated in all the leading periodicals, English and American, from the beginning of the century down to January, 1852. To those who live within the vicinity of large libraries, where periodical literature has accumulated largely, or who possess an accumulation of it, such a manual will be invaluable. By its aid the examination of any subject of general interest can be pursued through its tortuous windings amid every hue and shade of thought, and amid the various and conflicting "schools" of opinion, of one of which almost every great periodical is an organ. If we take up the book and look for any leading subject, in which men now feel an interest, such as Religion, Education, Geology, Poetry, Missions, Railroads, &c. ; or great names, such as Plato, Luther, Byron, Cromwell, &c., we find several pages covered with the mere list of articles written on each by various pens and in various periodicals. Where it could be done the names of the writers are given.

A word, however, we have of abatement. Of course, without the next thing to omniscience, a work like this could not be made perfect, or entirely free from inaccuracies. Our own unpretending, and yet, we would modestly say, valuable "Review," has been entirely omitted in the author's list, and our neighbor, the "Evangelical," has been put down as published at "Mercersburgh." This was a little annoying ; but in answer to a private letter the author assures us that it was because he could not ascertain, after much inquiry, where sets of these "Reviews" could be obtained, and succeeded in obtaining nothing more than the table of contents of the first volume of the "Evangelical." All this, we are promised, will be rectified in a future edition. We take the liberty to quote from his letter. "I have undertaken the task of indexing periodicals as a pure labor of love. It has employed a good share of my time for six years. I have not received as yet the first cent of pecuniary remuneration, while on the other hand I have expended for books, literary assistance, &c., sever-

al hundred dollars. I have no expectation that I shall receive from the sales of this edition, more than my actual expenses upon it. Under these circumstances—considering that my labors are of immense advantage to the proprietors of periodicals,—one house in this city freely admitting that my work has raised the value of their stock \$1000—it seems but simple justice that editors and proprietors of periodicals should furnish me with their publications. Several editors have already sent me their sets. It is not only necessary that I should have the volumes themselves to secure accuracy in indexing in the first place, but I need them near me for constant reference.”

It is proposed in a future edition to give an historical account of the leading periodicals, comprising their origin, editors, prominent contributors, peculiar views in literature, politics, religion, &c, in which account it is hoped the “*Mercersburg*” will have a chapter. C.

THE MISSION OF THE COMFORTER, *with Notes.* By Charles Julius Hare, A. M. Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1854. 12mo. pp. 498.

THIS is certainly a very peaceable and evangelical, almost Baxterian title of a book, and the reader would hardly suspect that beneath it were concealed the weapons of polemical war. It is, nevertheless, a bold, unsparing, and withal, highly valuable contribution to controversial literature. In the five sermons, however, which it contains, its controversial character—which is after all the most effective mode of controversy—is limited to the straight forward and powerful statement and enforcement of gospel truth, always in view, it is true, of certain erroneous tendencies. In the Notes the author deals the weapons more directly against acknowledged adversaries, Romanism and Tractarianism on the one hand, and Rationalism on the other. Archdeacon Hare belongs to that evangelical and somewhat modern party in the Church of England, distinguished for their zeal and spirituality, who have been deeply influenced by the thinking of Coleridge and the better class of German theologians, and who yet blend harmoniously with such thinking, and assert vigorously, the great central truths of spiritual religion. In the work before us he puts forth and elucidates in a masterly manner, comprehensive and timely views of the work of the Holy Spirit, and the great doctrine of faith in Christ as the ground of salvation. The style is characterised by great freshness and vigor, and abounds in original and suggestive thought. The book has a few peculiarities which will not suit American Christianity, but we are truly glad of its republication in this country. C.